

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO

ORAL HISTORY, 1972-73

Interviewee: Twelve members of the University of Nevada, Reno, community

Interviewed: 1972-1973

Published: 1973

Interviewer: Ruth G. Hilts

UNOHP Catalog #060

Description

Twelve University of Nevada-Reno leaders were interviewed in the third volume of this joint project conducted by the Oral History Program and University Archives. Those interviewed included Paul Havas, president, Alumni Association; Anne B. Howard, president, American Association of University Professors; Richard L. Elmore, president, Associated Students of the University of Nevada (ASUN); John Bradford, president, ASUN Senate; Harold Jacobsen, chairman, Board of Regents; John Dodson, co-director, Center For Religion and Life; Ann Peterson, chairwoman, Commission on the Status of Women; Joseph N. Crowley, chairman, Faculty Senate; Ruth H. Donovan, president, Faculty Women's Caucus; Hugh N. Mozingo, president, and James T. Richardson, vice-president, National Society of Professors; Luella Lilly, director, Women's Athletics; Rayona M. Sharpnack, general representative, Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Council.

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO
ORAL HISTORY, 1972-73

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO
ORAL HISTORY, 1972-73

An Oral History Conducted by by Ruth G. Hilts

University of Nevada Oral History Program

Copyright 1973
University of Nevada Oral History Program
Mail Stop 0324
Reno, Nevada 89557
unohp@unr.edu
<http://www.unr.edu/oralhistory>

All rights reserved. Published 1973.
Printed in the United States of America

Publication Staff:
Director: Mary Ellen Glass

University of Nevada Oral History Program Use Policy

All UNOHP interviews are copyrighted materials. They may be downloaded and/or printed for personal reference and educational use, but not republished or sold. Under “fair use” standards, excerpts of up to 1000 words may be quoted for publication without UNOHP permission as long as the use is non-commercial and materials are properly cited. The citation should include the title of the work, the name of the person or people interviewed, the date of publication or production, and the fact that the work was published or produced by the University of Nevada Oral History Program (and collaborating institutions, when applicable). Requests for permission to quote for other publication, or to use any photos found within the transcripts, should be addressed to the UNOHP, Mail Stop 0324, University of Nevada, Reno, Reno, NV 89557-0324. Original recordings of most UNOHP interviews are available for research purposes upon request.

CONTENTS

Preface to the Digital Edition	ix
Introduction	xi
1. Alumni Association <i>Paul Havas, President</i>	1
2. American Association of University Professors <i>Anne B. Howard, President</i>	11
3. Associated Students of the University of Nevada <i>Richard L. Elmore, President</i>	21
4. Associated Students of the University of Nevada Senate <i>John Bradford, President</i>	31
5. Board of Regents <i>Harold Jacobsen, Chairman</i>	49
6. Center for Religion and Life <i>John Dodson, Co-Director</i>	67
7. Commission on the Status of Women <i>Ann Peterson, Chairwoman</i>	79

8. Faculty Senate	83
<i>Joseph N. Crowley, Chairman</i>	
9. Faculty Women's Caucus	95
<i>Ruth H. Donovan, President</i>	
10. National Society of Professors	103
<i>Hugh N. Mazingo, President</i>	
<i>James T. Richardson, Vice-President</i>	
11. Women's Athletics	127
<i>Luella Lilly, Director</i>	
12. Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Council	
<i>Rayona N. Sharpnack, General Representative</i>	133
Original Index: For Reference Only	143

PREFACE TO THE DIGITAL EDITION

Established in 1964, the University of Nevada Oral History Program (UNOHP) explores the remembered past through rigorous oral history interviewing, creating a record for present and future researchers. The program's collection of primary source oral histories is an important body of information about significant events, people, places, and activities in twentieth and twenty-first century Nevada and the West.

The UNOHP wishes to make the information in its oral histories accessible to a broad range of patrons. To achieve this goal, its transcripts must speak with an intelligible voice. However, no type font contains symbols for physical gestures and vocal modulations which are integral parts of verbal communication. When human speech is represented in print, stripped of these signals, the result can be a morass of seemingly tangled syntax and incomplete sentences—totally verbatim transcripts sometimes verge on incoherence. Therefore, this transcript has been lightly edited.

While taking great pains not to alter meaning in any way, the editor may have removed false starts, redundancies, and the “uhs,” “ahs,” and other noises with which speech is often liberally sprinkled; compressed some passages which, in unaltered form, misrepresent the chronicler's meaning; and relocated some material to place information in its intended context. Laughter is represented with [laughter] at the end of a sentence in which it occurs, and ellipses are used to indicate that a statement has been interrupted or is incomplete...or that there is a pause for dramatic effect.

As with all of our oral histories, while we can vouch for the authenticity of the interviews in the UNOHP collection, we advise readers to keep in mind that these are remembered pasts, and we do not claim that the recollections are entirely free of error. We can state, however, that the transcripts accurately reflect the oral history recordings on which they were based. Accordingly, each transcript should be approached with the

same prudence that the intelligent reader exercises when consulting government records, newspaper accounts, diaries, and other sources of historical information. All statements made here constitute the remembrance or opinions of the individuals who were interviewed, and not the opinions of the UNOHP.

In order to standardize the design of all UNOHP transcripts for the online database, most have been reformatted, a process that was completed in 2012. This document may therefore differ in appearance and pagination from earlier printed versions. Rather than compile entirely new indexes for each volume, the UNOHP has made each transcript fully searchable electronically. If a previous version of this volume existed, its original index has been appended to this document for reference only. A link to the entire catalog can be found online at <http://oralhistory.unr.edu/>.

For more information on the UNOHP or any of its publications, please contact the University of Nevada Oral History Program at Mail Stop 0324, University of Nevada, Reno, NV, 89557-0324 or by calling 775/784-6932.

Alicia Barber
Director, UNOHP
July 2012

INTRODUCTION

This is the third volume of the *University of Nevada, Reno, Oral History*, the product of an ongoing program of the Oral History Project and the University Archives. Thirteen members of the University community, selected by virtue of their leadership of boards, committees, or campus organizations, contributed their comments on goals and achievements during their past year in office, along with their views on issues of interest to the University as a whole.

The length of the tape-recorded interview sessions was determined solely by the interviewee's available time and desire to discuss current problems. In three instances, important events occurring after the initial interview made a second recording session necessary. Remarks were transcribed verbatim, edited for ease in reading, and returned to the authors for their approval and minor corrections. In submitting scripts for the author's review, it was stressed that the *oral* quality should be preserved, and except for occasional minor word changes for clarity's sake, most acceded. The resulting scripts may

lack the literary quality their authors might produce with pen or typewriter, but have, instead, the immediacy and impact of the contemporary spoken word.

This year, unlike several in recent memory, passed quietly and without a news-making occurrence or issue to galvanize the community into action or verbal reaction. Or so it seemed until almost the end of spring semester, when the full implications of the legislative appropriation and resulting work program began to emerge. Voices then were raised in angry disbelief and protest. Faculty and administrative officers, grown accustomed to amity, found themselves in opposition. Because the school year had almost finished, student awareness or reaction went unrecorded; however, requests were granted to update some already completed interviews with other members of the University community. The tenor of the volume thus changed from quietude to agitation.

The purpose of this program is to record history and thus to create a research document,

so when the climax occurred at year's end instead of conveniently in the middle, we quickly recorded the supplementary comments of active participants. In compiling this volume, we intend to provide a service to future historians; however, for those contemporaries who read it, we hope the candid opinions expressed will open avenues of understanding between those who have heretofore misunderstood each other's motives.

Ruth G. Hilts, Interviewer
University of Nevada, Reno
1973

ALUMNI ASSOCIATION

PAUL HAVAS, PRESIDENT

Paul Havas: My name is Paul Havas. I'm currently president of the University of Nevada Alumni Association. Our goals for the year of 1972-73 are very numerous and are as follows:

We are, again, interested in being successful in our Annual Giving, our fund raising drive. We realize that fund raising is a central part of an alumni association, and our goal this year is in the area of \$40,000. Corky Lingenfelter is the Current Annual Giving chairman, and he has designed a very, very fine letter, which has within its framework certain boxes which need to be checked, and these boxes are earmarked by such statements as "Employer matching the contributions made by employee." The amount of the contribution, of course, is called for, the particular designation, whether it should be restricted, and specifically designated, or whether it should be unrestricted, thereby allowing the Alumni Association to dedicate the monies in the manner that it should see fit.

We have a real opportunity with the ensuing centennial, which commences on

October 12, 1974. We have within our grasp a Homecoming celebration this coming October of 1973, which is characterized as a "Gateway to the Centennial." Two things here, of course: we contemplate a very successful Homecoming, and we anticipate a very, very successful centennial. I should state initially that Homecoming has been a very, very difficult program to formulate, simply because people change in their value orientations vis-à-vis Homecoming. Diverse people have diverse ideas about what Homecoming means, and what kinds of operational concepts, what kinds of activities should exist with a Homecoming program.

This year, we intend to have extensive activity with the chapters that exist in southern California, San Francisco, and elsewhere. We hope to bring these people in for Homecoming. A fun train is scheduled. The details have been worked out with the Reno Chamber of Commerce. I know that the San Francisco alumni chapter is coming in. A good majority of their members will

travel to Reno on this fun train, and this should help the Homecoming celebration.

Now, as far as the centennial, we, of course, envision the two major aspects of a centennial celebration as President Miller has provided it. One, that the academic aspect be exhausted through the use of symposiums, lectures, and so forth; and secondly, that fund raising should be attempted in such a manner that we raise more monies than that which we normally raise in an average year. The Alumni Association has selected four persons to head up major centennial committees, and they are Hans Wolfe, Virginia Phillips, Jack McAuliffe, and Clark Santini. The faculty of the University of Nevada is selecting four persons, and the students of the University are selecting four persons.

Now, in regard to the centennial, there is a related committee which has been hard at work for many—actually, for the last three or four years, and that is the Morrill Hall Committee. This committee is concerned with the restoration of Morrill Hall, and it has been very, very busy, particularly under the leadership of Jack McAuliffe, a local attorney. This committee now has consummated an agreement with the Franklin Mint for the minting of five thousand silver medallions which will be issued by the University of Nevada Alumni Association, and this issuance will commemorate the University's 100th birthday in 1974. The funds raised with the centennial medallion will be applied toward the association's long-planned project to restore Morrill Hall, the original building on the Reno campus. Designed by Nevada artist Robert Caples, one side of the medallion depicts the geographical outline of the state superimposed upon the Block N, long used as a symbol by the University. The other side will show Morrill Hall. Only five thousand medallions will be coined by the Franklin

Mint of Philadelphia. Of course, this is the mint which has produced most of Nevada's unique gambling tokens during the shortage of metal dollars. Persons contributing a hundred dollars or more to the Morrill Hall Restoration Fund will receive the centennial medallion.

It should also be stated that the restoration plans call for a faculty club and dining room in the basement, with the alumni office and the University Press continuing to be quartered on the main floor. The second floor will be a reception area to be used for meetings and other activities, and the top floor will be available as a University museum. The building would be brought into conformity with modern Structural and fire codes, but retain the Victorian decor. The only change from the original appearance would be the addition of a two-story veranda at the rear of the building. Reno architect Edward S. Parsons has done the preliminary design work.

So, in summary, the University of Nevada has authorized the Alumni Association for the Reno campus to coin a medallion commemorating the centennial of the University. The legislature in 1873 authorized the creation of the University of Nevada in Elko. On October twelfth, 1874, the first students were admitted to the University. So [on] October twelfth, 1974, a hundred years of service will be cited.

This last year, 1971-1972, Project Ask, a career-oriented counseling service, was instituted by the University of Nevada Alumni Association. Project Ask calls for the bringing together of community leaders and students, particularly in the business community and the professional community. And this concept allows for interaction between businessmen and women, and professional men and women, and students. Students

meet with these representatives of businesses and professions to learn more about job opportunities and qualifications needed, while the businessmen and professionals realize the students' background and training. Thus, the businessmen, from listening to and counseling the students, can make suggestions about the University's curriculum. In some instances, the businessmen and professionals might even get involved on the teaching end. Now, we've really gone forward in this area, and our goal is consistent with previous years' goal, of making this project truly successful. We have sent out inquiries, questionnaires, to a hundred business people and professional persons, and the response has been very, very positive, and thus far, the program has been extremely successful.

[In] terms of the success of our Legislative Study Committee and the rules governing a nonprofit organization, such as the University of Nevada Alumni Association, we can not only cite certain goals, but we can bear in mind certain accomplishments. First, this committee has helped to introduce a resolution in the legislature which cites the centennial celebration. This truly gives the centennial the sanction of the state of Nevada and its total governmental bodies. The legislation affecting the University and its policies is continually surveyed and analyzed by this committee, and we can only hope to bring into more acute focus those issues and problems that may exist relative to the University.

We feel that the quality and quantity of publicity is a perpetual goal. The efforts and work with our publications, such as the newsletter [*Alumni News*] have realized great success through the assistance of a member of the journalism department, Ron Vacchina. Our Publications Committee has urged a broad base, a diversity of articles. We will have

had four newsletters this year, and there are a couple more in the offing if time and funds allow it.

We have a very active Student Relations and Activities Committee. The goal here, of course, is to foster and improve relations with students, and channel the needs and thoughts of the students to the alumni, helping with student-University projects.

We have a very active Rules and By-laws Committee. The objectives of this committee are to correlate with the thoughts and considerations of the implementive committee, which is concerned with change, the kind of change that is necessary for a progressive Alumni Association.

We have a very active Finance Committee under the direction of Al Pagni, our treasurer. And Al, of course, is concerned with not only budget preparation, but he is also concerned with such subcommittee functions under finance as special projects.

The Special Projects Committee, this year, is still interested and hopeful that it can present the expressed needs of faculty and students on campus. Special projects means those areas of need that the alumni can get involved with, and can contribute towards fulfillment, with and through the use of funds and human involvement. Certain special projects this year that the University of Nevada Alumni Association has been involved with are as follows:

We have sustained certain monies for support of the University of Nevada parachute team. Cecelia St. John's committee on special projects has approved certain money requests which the Alumni Association as a whole has supported. Certain special projects have been approved; these have been recommended by the committee and seconded by the association as a whole. And among those projects are a \$1,000 grant to finance a building of

communications research, literally a laboratory room in the Speech and Drama Department. The Alumni Association has contributed five hundred dollars to the campus YWCA, to their operating fund for the remainder of the spring semester of '73. This is due to the feeling of alumni that Y offers a variety of programs to the campus and the community. The Alumni Association has provided two hundred and forty-five dollars to redecorate the large foyer area of the top floor of the Frandsen Humanities [building] for the purpose of creating an area conducive to studying and social exchange for students. The committee recommended this grant simply because this particular building has been lacking the kind of acceptable area for students and instructors to get together and meet on a social basis.

Other requests, of course, have been made, and the Special Projects Committee is continuously analyzing these requests.

I stated earlier that through Project Ask, perhaps certain curriculum changes would be effectuated. This year, we have established for the first time, to the best of my knowledge, a curriculum committee, headed up by Gene Grotegut. They have been meeting throughout the course of the year, and perhaps a culmination of their efforts will exist in an open meeting of the Graduate Council in May, wherein certain members of the Alumni Association will be present, and we feel confident that a great deal of good will emanate therefrom.

We have a very active Alumni-Faculty Relations [Committee]. This is headed by Hans Wolfe, and everybody reports that this program has been successful, and perhaps this program will facilitate such things as open houses during Homecoming, open houses on the part of the colleges.

We should have excellent feedback once again, because of the efforts rendered by the

Alumni Association pursuant to the Jazz Festival. This festival has grown from five to 250 [and over] bands through the years. This year, Mexico entered, so the name is now the Reno International Jazz Festival. There [were] 9,000 students in Reno during the week of the festival. The Alumni Association purchased a total of four trophies, and gave away the grand trophy. It was truly a successful effort, and Beverly Hudson should be again commended for her efforts.

We just experienced a symposium on fund raising, if I may return to fund raising. We had present Dean Sam Basta, who is now the field man for the University of Nevada Alumni Association; and we had President Miller present. This fund raising group discussion was enacted for the purposes of coordinating, originating concepts and ideas and direction for fund raising, and I would like to draw upon the discussion itself.

We started out in our discussion with Larry Struve, who was the previous Year's Annual Giving chairman. Larry began by saying that the Alumni Association was searching for identity, and as a direct result, they formed an ad hoc committee last year for this purpose. This committee decided that the most significant thing that the Alumni Association did was the Annual Giving program and fund raising, but that the end result was insignificant in regards to the University budget. Larry strongly feels that there is a need for a professional Annual Giving staff, but doesn't know how, where, when, or where. This professional staff should work with all the University, and should be funded through the University budget. Ted Lokke, this year's secretary, was asked to comment on the American Alumni Council Conference he attended two years ago. The most important thing he learned was, "If you want to raise money, go

after it professionally, since fund raising is a competitive business.” He also suggested the Annual Giving chairman should have a co-chairman to take over the following year, obviously for purposes of continuity.

I made the comment that the Alumni Association has never been involved in big money, and asked President Miller to define Ambassador Reams’ job function. Ambassador Reams, of course, has been in charge of alumni relations. President Miller answered that the ambassador’s job was fund raising activities, which involved 1] technical advice; 2] the direct approach [which is a secondary role]; 3] cultivating sources, both sociably and politically, which has been his major task; and 4] miscellaneous jobs which include advising on projects and public relations, and working closely with Ed Olsen.

In answer to my question concerning the past role of the alumni president and officers in the Annual Giving program, Dr. Botsford said that the president’s role changes every year, and he feels it’s to promote the program, not to run it. Judy Nash, this year’s second vice president, stated that she would like to see a paid professional in the future, and have the role of the director of alumni development be defined. She feels when a person volunteers, he is pretty well spent after giving himself to his job and family, so there isn’t much left for the association.

Corky Lingenfelter, this year’s Annual Giving chairman, stated that there are conflicts developing in the Annual Giving program, and therefore, a professional staff is needed, which would allow the alums to work on a personal basis rather than administrative.

I told the committee that the community of Reno is distinct in that it is more stratified than the average community, and because of this, the Alumni Association would have to train and guide the professional so he could

serve as an influence, and thereby reach the constituent members of these particular groups that exist in Reno’s stratified society.

President Miller offered his thoughts on what had been said, and he stated that the first problem has been a lack of a sense of direction in how to get there. The association has been on a regime without a framework; and because of this, he can’t relate to the association. He doesn’t know what the association wants and cannot move in on them. President Miller stressed the point that we will be making a mistake if we focus on annual giving only. People would lose interest. Other things are essential, such as developing chapters, having a field representative, Homecoming, and so on. As far as his position on the professional; President Miller said that all the eggs cannot be in the alumni basket because there are always going on certain other fund raising activities, and that there were alumni of colleges, as well as of the University.

Corky suggested forming an ad hoc committee to study this and to come along with some kind of decision or formulation in this realm.

In regards to fund raising, President Miller felt that there were three areas to really be concerned about—the Alumni Association, the ongoing routine [number two], and the centennial. He stressed the fact that he has given the association a full-time secretary and Dean Sam Basta’s services.

Now, it should be noted that President Miller invited a group of officers present at this group discussion to make inputs to him on Ambassador Reams’ replacement, and the job definition of Ambassador Reams’ replacement.

The officers of the Alumni Association and I, and other persons, believe that the administration should define more explicitly their goals relative to our organization. flow

important is fund raising? Of course, when you discuss fund raising, you should also define the respective responsibilities of those persons in charge of positions relative to fund raising. Many of the alumni feel that the administration should define more clearly certain job definitions: What are the ultimate responsibilities of the director of Alumni Relations and the director of Community Relations? Many of us feel that there is a tremendous amount of financial assistance present with alumni, and that this financial aid could be exploited in a very, very healthy sense by skilled, conscientious professionals. And it certainly begins with a well-defined job description which lends itself to a more centralized, better coordinated, more properly managed fund raising program. Whether this is restricted to alumni fund raising, or whether it overlaps to community fund raising, [or] if it transcends these boundaries and engages the fund raising results of foundations, the important thing is that the boundaries are established and persons respect the roles and the scope of responsibilities. Again, this has not been a goal of our organization, [to] tell the administration how to define these positions. We obviously have been more concerned with our own house, and our own organizational structure, and we have worked hard this year, perhaps in part, so we could offer certain suggestions to the University administration.

I might like to add that I personally have been very impressed with the efforts of Dean Sam Basta and his rendered assistance to the Alumni Association, particularly in the areas of chapters [and the] beginnings of the centennial. He has helped me greatly with a new committee, a Speakers Bureau, which obviously communicates that which we are concerned with in the community and elsewhere. Ambassador Reams has done a

monumental job with that which he's had to work with, because he has worked devoid of structure. He has created his own structure, and he has become a very influential man in the community, and has raised a great deal of money, and has elevated the influence of the University in the community.

Returning to a very general subject, and that being communication in relationship to the administration, to the faculty, to the students, and to the community—this Speakers Bureau has been effectively used. We intend to use it more strongly in the years to come. Of course, we've had such audio-visual aids as the student-alumni film we took three years to create. This film will positively enhance the image of the University, and has been used by the Speakers Bureau.

We hope that many alums will appear before service organizations, and that these efforts will involve people substantially with the activities of the University, and, as a side effect and product, I'm sure that certain private contributions will flow as a direct result.

In general, our administration will be one of refinement and improvement, and we intend to attract as many new alums as possible. We want to bring these people into the Alumni Association. We want everyone to realize that an alum is anyone who has attended the University of Nevada, Reno, for a semester or more.

Returning to the subject of chapters, we want the association to push for chapter expansion, which includes plans for alumni chapters in Elko, Ely, Winnemucca, Lake Tahoe, and Washington, D. C. As a midpoint goal, we are attempting to get people involved with the up-and-coming Homecoming celebration. We have written letters, we have contacted persons in New York City and elsewhere to think about coming back to the

University of Nevada's 99th Homecoming, Gateway to the Centennial.

We also contemplate the utilization of the centennial as a means towards chapter growth and development. We contemplate such tools as the selection of distinguished alumni, an advisory council of alums who exist outside the Reno area. And frankly, with the increased manpower that we now have with the physical presence of Dean Sam Basta, we positively feel that our chapters will grow, if we can just get them involved in our various programs.

Respecting the subject of athletics, I personally would like to initially offer a comment. I believe that the support of athletics should never be negated by an alumni association even when there's an active boosters organization. An alumni association can never afford to be labeled as being exclusively academic-oriented, and it must cover a broad base of the population, as a boosters organization might. This literally means that if we intend to get involved with people who have attended the University just a semester, or a year, or two years, or if we wanted to get involved with distinguished business people who are just friends of the University, we have to be concerned with athletics, and we should be. Athletics cover a broad base, and certainly, stimulation in this area is very easily obtained.

Consequently, our association has been involved this year in many areas of athletics. Our Special Projects Committee have supported a parachute team. We've just pledged five hundred dollars to the women's gymnastics squad on campus who are going to Des Moines for a championship competition. We obviously feel that other competitive areas, such as debate, are just as important, but we realize that you have to get involved with projects as they emerge, and we've certainly had some interesting opportunities

with the University of Nevada realizing great success nationally this year in areas such as the ski team, the parachute team, women's gymnastics, and certain other extracurricular athletic activities. We endeavor to maintain this interest in athletics, and when the opportunity arises, we look forward to our involvement.

In terms of possibilities for future growth and development of the Alumni Association, many of us feel that the organization needs to be overhauled, that the executive association has to reduce its numbers for the purposes of policy formation, and that perhaps a new chapter reorganization will allow for a Reno-Sparks chapter, which will be involved in a greater number of social-educational-cultural areas of interest. The policy making body should be reduced in size. These people are more actively involved in the actual administration of an Alumni Association. It seems to many of us that this kind of overhauling will make possible better articulation, improve communication, and certainly a more democratic organization. It is conceivable that a large body of alums could vote for two candidates proposed by an active board, a reduced board—I should say a board that has been reduced in size.

The critics of this kind of an overhaul have claimed that if we have democratic elections wherein two candidates are nominated, first, where are we going to find the candidates? Secondly, how will we carry out the election? But it occurs to many of us that if we have a well-functioning Alumni Association under the auspices of 1] a professional who manages the organization; 2] an administrative body of directors that is reduced in size, wherein more business can be handled—. [Telephone interruption]

The critics of decisive changes in our current organizational structure feel that if

we reduce the size of the executive association and expand upon our chapter organization, we will lose a lot of the people who want to be involved in business. It is our feeling, however, that this kind of energy and interest in administration can be transposed to a chapter organization. Again, I'm speaking perhaps as an individual, but I also speak, I think, for most of the officers of this year's administration. We know that our meetings could run more smoothly if they were involved with exclusively business, or if they were involved exclusively with programs. For instance, we had a very successful program this year on whether or not Nevada needs a law school. This program was monitored and conveyed by and through the use of Channel Two television, and has been shown statewide. These kind[s] of programs can be very effective, and many of us feel that they can be repeated and conducted on a chapter level. It is our feeling that an executive board of directors which has been reduced in size can plan the business and the administration of the Alumni Association, and that it doesn't have to encompass a size of seventy-five, or a hundred, or a hundred and fifty persons, and that it is self-defeating to consider an expansion of interested alumni, and the inclusion of interested alumni, when we also have as a simultaneous goal the management of more efficient meetings.

In final summary, the University of Nevada Alumni Association is truly looking forward to the future years with an eye on reorganization so that many areas which have been previously untapped can now be dealt with. We can get involved in areas of public policy, we can get involved with the social problems of our time, and certainly, our programs offer much to the attainment of this goal. We can talk about race relations on campus, we can talk about athletics, we can talk

about student-alumni interaction, we can talk about alumni relations to the administration. We can give a more honest rendition of what actually exists by reorganizing our Alumni Association in a manner which allows for continuing, healthy programs. Many of us feel that we can improve the quality and quantity of administration and work efforts by redesigning our structure.

We certainly feel that we should take a lesson from this year's organizational chart, a chart that has been disseminated to all members, which truly makes clear certain lines of authority from officers which represent a steering committee, to permanent standing committees which consist of finance, Annual Giving, Special Projects, Homecoming Programs dominating, to alumni chapters and individual alumni, and that under these standing committees, we should have special committees and programs, and special alumni activities. Under Special Alumni Activities, we have seen the successful efforts of the art exhibit, the Golden Reunion, graduation reception, the Jazz Festival, memorials, and we have a basis now for future University of Nevada, Las Vegas and Reno joint conferences, which will probably commence in 1974. Much of the planning for this has been established this year, 1973. We envision better communication in this area.

Under Special Committees and Programs, we have met with much success under the Alumni Faculty Relations Committee. Under Campus Needs, we saw, with the efforts of Tom Stevens, a reassessment of physical needs on campus. Tom analyzed the replanting of elms along the quad, and his wisdom was conceded by the plant people on campus. The chapter organization curriculum-implemented legislative studies, student activities, Morrill Hall restoration, Project Ask, publicity, alumni publication, rules and

by-laws, which are so concerned with the restructuring of the Alumni Association [if that is to be the will of the majority], and the Speakers Bureau. From this current organization, and a reorganized structure of the future, the University of Nevada Alumni Association should grow and should become a more integral part of the University scene.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF
UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS
ANNE B. HOWARD, PRESIDENT

Anne E. Howard: The American Association of University Professors has not been wildly active this year, but I think this is perhaps in the nature of the organization, that it is a low profile group, except when there is trouble. And when there is trouble, when there's conflict, people want to belong to some sort of professorial group, and want to react in some fashion. This year, in a way, perhaps it's good that we haven't had any violent issues which have forced us to participate, to call urgent meetings at which faculty could converse about this subject and that and the other. Consequently, we've been a rather quiet group.

We had one meeting in November, which was directed towards this year's legislature, which might be of some interest to a good many people. We invited an officer of the western district of AAUP, Dr. Thomas Ambrogi, to come talk to us about collective bargaining. And although we didn't have a wildly well-attended meeting, we did exchange a number of ideas about what sorts of things faculty members wanted for

collective bargaining, and what kind of thing needed to be done.

Perhaps the major impetus for this meeting was the formation this year of another organization of University professors, the National Society of Professors, which operates under the aegis of the National Education Association. This group, which formed last spring, prided itself on having four former Faculty Senate chairmen as members of the organization, and introduced itself originally as a group that was going to go out and get collective bargaining for professors. Well, this caused a little bit of conflict, although it was interesting to note that the membership—inasmuch as NSP is public—has a tremendous lap-over. Both of us are minority organizations. NSP claims to have about eighty-five members. The AAUP had a hundred. [It may have less than that now; the membership tends to fall when there are no difficulties.]

At the time of the Adaman business, our membership went up, and interest went up. Last year, I think the introduction of the

college code by the administrators after three years of faculty work, with no recognition of what the faculty had done, so discouraged the faculty that they are not really much interested in organizing for a particular purpose. But our meeting in the fall about collective bargaining was intended to get both groups together so that we could talk about some of the issues that are raised. Dr. Ambrogi tried to cover the subject quite generally, and made a number of points which I think affected our attitude towards things that happened in the legislature.

That, perhaps, is one of our second activities. The executive board met and felt that it was necessary for AAUP to react to the legislation that was presented this spring to bring faculty members under collective bargaining of some sort. This is always a touchy question. It's very easy for people to say, "Oh, we are college professors! We are professionals. We, therefore, do not act like trade unions. We do not act like working people." However, the fact of the matter is that, unlike other professionals, unlike the dentist, the doctor, the lawyer, we do not set our own wages. I've often thought it would be lots of fun to engage in the private practice of teaching, and I even worked out a beautiful system whereby I would have all sorts of assistants and aids. If a student came in to me with a rotten theme, I would assign him to a spelling therapist, who would charge five dollars a visit. I would assign him to a penmanship therapist, who would charge five dollars a visit. I would send him through our lab to determine what his sentence symptoms were, and by the time I got him out of there for a diagnostic session, I would collect sixty bucks, about forty-five of which would be [mine]. But we don't engage in the private practice of education. We are paid employees. And because we are employees, rather than

free-lance professionals, we are dependent upon our employers for what pay we get.

Now, a few years ago, it was quite possible for a professor to say, "All right, I don't like the way you pay me. I'll go someplace else." Well, in the past few years, the multiplication of bright, young people in academic life and the drop in enrollment in universities has changed the market to such a degree that this isn't the easiest way to go up the ladder, and it's necessary to improve your own position. Consequently, we are interested in collective bargaining. At present, the way we arrange salaries is a kind of polite request, which is handled by a faculty committee, which says to the regents, "Dear Regents, we think we need this much money to maintain the quality of the University. Would you please give it to us?" And we negotiate back and forth, and we then negotiate with the legislature, and if they're not mad at us about some minor little matter, we get money, to one degree or another. Now, this is fairly acceptable on occasion, yet we are aware that it isn't always going to work, and it would be far better if we could have a more realistic approach to handling salaries.

So both AAUP, which is an old-fashioned organization— it's probably the oldest academic organization in the country—and NSP, which is a slightly younger group, have tried to get together and talk about collective bargaining. AAUP is new in this field, but it has been named bargaining agent in a number of large universities, and perhaps has gotten interested in collective bargaining just because of the existence of groups like the American Federation of Teachers and the NSP, which [are] organizations dedicated much more vigorously to such matters as collective bargaining. AAUP has for years been concerned with academic standards, with academic freedom—in fact, it was for

years the only organization that anybody knew about. We all resented it because it was slow, because it was conservative [in spite of what people in Nevada think, it is a very conservative organization], and because getting any action out of it was very, very difficult. I think people in Nevada who have been here longer than I have remember the bad old days in the time of President Stout, when the University was finally censured by the AAUP, which was a kind of national recognition [laughing], maybe of a sort that we didn't want. But AAUP has been concerned with the way universities run more than it has with bread and butter issues, even though its standards and its statistics on how professors are paid are the standards used throughout the country. Our own university has, for years, referred entirely to AAUP schedules and statistics of who gets paid what at certain classes of universities. And for a long time, our salaries were based on this.

We felt it was time that there should be some actual collective bargaining, and there have been two or three approaches to this. The NSP and AAUP managed to agree on a great many things, and our feeling was that the best thing that could happen to faculty members would be to include them under the Dodge Act, which allows collective bargaining for public employees. Actually, it was at the request of the University Board of Regents that university professors were specifically *excluded* from this when the act was passed. We felt this was a little bit unfair, and what we wanted most of all was simply to include faculty in that act as it exists. There would be some minor matters to deal with, but we were not interested in a long, complicated change of bargaining.

Well, the administration came up with a bill which was sponsored by the Senate Judiciary Committee, I believe, or—well, I've

forgotten—the City and County Governments Committee, which created what union people would call a “company union,” that had all the disadvantages and complications of collective bargaining by a free bargaining agent, but which ended as our present bargaining procedures do, with the Board of Regents. One could hire a professional arbitrator to decide what was wrong, but what he decided is not binding upon the regents. Now, this is in no way different from what we have now, except that we are involved in paying for bargainers, we have to get a bargaining agent, and we have to deal through these people, and we have to go through a tremendous amount of machinery to get the same results—that is, we say, “Please,” and the regents say, “Yes,” or “No,” according to their will. Admittedly, they have been generous sometimes, but there have been occasions when they have been not so friendly to our suggestions.

This is, again, an instance of how AAUP and NSP worked. I went, as president of AAUP, to testify against this bill, as did various members of NSP, and a number of faculty members who went simply on their own. We did manage to get that particular bill killed.

It had other disadvantages. For example, it indicated a rather peculiar lack of understanding of the way this University works. It treated department chairmen as if they were managers and employers. Actually, most departments on this campus have a chairman who might be considered a spokesman for the department, rather than its boss. I think that is the general attitude, that the chairman is there to represent the will of the department. Our departmental bylaws say, for example, that the chairman is obligated to express our views. If he disagrees, he may disagree, but he has to express our views to the higher levels of administration whether he likes them or not. We may recall our

chairman if he does not please us. We choose our chairman. We have never yet had a dean go over our heads and say, "No, you can't have that chairman." And it's been customary for deans, certainly in the recent past, to take the recommendation of the department in appointing a chairman. It's been the habit of the president to go along with this, so that the chairman is really not the way we see it here—there may be some exceptions—a boss, who is hired from above, to handle the peons down below, but rather a chief peon, if you will. [We look at him that way.] Yet this bill would have removed department chairmen from the bargaining unit, as if they were members of management.

Now, a faculty member who is department chairman does not get any of the rewards of management, which are: a higher salary scale that isn't necessarily the same as a faculty salary scale; a power over his fellow employees, which our department chairmen do not have. [Our dean does, but that's another matter.] He is, quite frequently, not even paid any extra for being department chairman. He may be relieved of one course to do his job. But in some departments, he doesn't even get any extra pay. So that to treat him as a management person is to misunderstand the way the University works. These are just some of the things that we objected to in the bill.

One of the interesting issues that was raised by the administration—I'm speaking here particularly of the chancellor's office; I have no idea how the various presidents feel about such things—was, they said, "We'd rather give them the right to strike than give them binding arbitration." And this we found, really, rather amusing, because I can't imagine either organization, or the Faculty Senate, or any but perhaps a tiny minority of our faculty ever feeling that they wanted the right to strike. Most of us are, in spite of what other

people think, quite dedicated to our jobs, and although we would like to have better salaries, we are not likely to stop the University for the sake of proving a point. A strike is out of line with most of our goals. Consequently, we found ourselves, these two organizations, thinking together rather nicely.

At present, as far as I know, there has been no final action on the bills, but it was the feeling of most faculty on campus that they would rather have no bill. They'd rather stay with the system that we have right now than have this complicated structure which was handed down by the administration. It is just another example of the sort of thing that we become so frustrated about, and which I think accounts for the fact that neither NSP nor AAUP has had a lot of support, or a lot of activity, this year, because the faculty become so frustrated with its efforts to direct itself.

We spent three years trying to write—and I say "we," meaning the faculty as a whole—a code. Two codes were presented to us. We voted on them. The one we voted in favor of was rejected in favor of one that was written by the administration. People come to resent being treated like small children, but it is true that it takes a while for this to build into any kind of directed activity. I think, right now, the campus is going through a period of disillusionment that says, "We've been treated like minors. What can we do?" I think either there will be some changes, or there is likely to be a growing anger which may make both organizations more active. I think we see this in faculty government, as well, that there is a kind of vague frustration—more or less defined frustration—in all directions simply because we are treated as if we were incapable of governing ourselves.

Perhaps a prime example of this was the Adamian case, which has recently had another response. There was a split in our faculty on

this matter. Nobody agreed that Adamian did right or wrong; there was a good deal of disagreement on the campus, and those who backed him quite frequently backed him in spite of their personal attitudes. Now, I, for one, felt that—I don't approve of that kind of activity, if he did it. I wasn't there, and nothing I have heard has convinced me that things were exactly as they were [reported] I know the duration of whatever went on was so minor—as I recall, the governor's car was stopped for a total of three minutes, and the demonstration that took place was a minor affair—I simply feel that the whole thing was a molehill exploded into a mountain by the fact that things were uncomfortable throughout the country at that stage. And Nevada, which had felt that it had students who went out and celebrated their president instead of having a demonstration, suddenly discovered that it wasn't any different from any place else. I think most of the support that Adamian had, had very little to do with his particular actions [whatever they were] [but] with the idea that the punishment should fit the crime. I would've been perfectly happy to see Paul censured, which was the recommendation of the committee, and which was the recommendation of the president, but I also knew him well as a colleague in the English department, and I knew what he had to offer. He is a superior scholar in his field, and an excellent teacher who inspired students to work hard, and he wasn't a soft grader. He was a man who expected a good deal out of his students. Now, if he had been a borderline case, I might've said, "well, perhaps not." But we had just awarded him tenure. He was a tenured professor. He was perfectly qualified for the job that he was asked to do. And it was not just the case of Paul Adamian, but the whole concept of tenure that I think was involved here.

The faculty, by a process which it developed, came to a conclusion about him. This conclusion, which was that he should be censured, not fired, was upheld by the president. And it seems to me that we are the people that know most about our campus, and it should have been our decision. The regents overruled that, I think, in fear of the public, or perhaps because they overreacted. There were stories, which I don't doubt, that members of the Board of Regents said they would see Paul Adamian fired if it was the last thing they did, long before the case was even heard, and this sort of thing does not make us feel particularly happy. But the fact that the faculty decision and the president's decision were overridden by the regents, again, destroyed the faith of the faculty in its being treated as if it were responsible people. We don't like to be treated like children.

I feel that Paul's abilities as a teacher far outweighed any mistakes he may have made in public behavior, but this is, of course, a matter of opinion. I'm happy that he's won the case.

I think that AAUP has always been involved with the question of position of the faculty on campus in relation to control, in relation to rule. It has not been, as I said, a bread and butter organization. And I think if we are less active than we might be this year, it is simply because of the sense of frustration.

I do feel that there has been an aroused interest in matters concerning women on campus. This campus is traditionally a few years behind other campuses in development. I don't understand exactly why. It may be because we are quite isolated, and, in many ways—I hope no one will be insulted—quite provincial. In spite of Nevada's sinful reputation, I think we're still very much a conservative state, like the center of Iowa, or Nebraska, or the wilds of South Dakota.

Women in our community—and, again, since the majority of our students come from our own community, whether you call it the state, or whether you call it the immediate area—are less aware, I think, than many others, although we have a great many women working. I have been told by someone that we have a higher proportion of women employed in Nevada than in almost any other state, that more women work. Lots of women work, but they work at jobs that are jobs in which they traditionally—well, I probably shouldn't use the word exploited, but they have been for so long it never occurs to them that there is any opportunity to do otherwise. I'm referring essentially to the clubs, and the sort of thing that goes on there. Girls come to the University without any particular awareness of the problems of women, partially because the high schools have not gotten involved in the women's movement at all, as far as I can tell. In fact, [they] seem to be downright unfriendly to any agitation, if you want to call it that. But I think in the last year or so, a number of women have caught on to the fact that they need not be treated as they have been treated, as minor people.

Our campus is very peculiar in the distribution of women. We have less than a hundred women in faculty and professional positions on campus out of six hundred professional positions, or something like that. In terms of actual faculty, I think the figure is more like 495. With this kind of comparison, at its wildest, we might say we had twenty percent women on campus. This is a guess. Yet, the distribution is such that a girl who goes to this University gets the idea that teaching in a university is not something that women do. Practically all of our women are concentrated into three places—the library, which has a fairly even

distribution between women and men, and these are professional positions; the Nursing School, where you would expect women to be; and the School of Home Economics. This, however, represents a minority of the students enrolled in the University. The College of Arts and Sciences gives a beautiful example of our circumstance, in that we have around two hundred [faculty] members [in] the College of Arts and Sciences, give or take a few, and of those, there are approximately eight women in the ranks.

There are another eight, perhaps, who are lecturers, or adjunct professors, or people like—well, Beatrice Gardner is a beautiful example. She came to this University about ten years ago, and the psychology department did not wish to hire her because they had hired her husband, which is an old story. I mean, it wasn't an official statement of this sort. So she went out and got a grant, which she has been using, as everybody knows, to teach chimpanzees sign language, which has probably brought this University more fame than any single project I can think of in the past ten years. And yet, interestingly, just this year, all of a sudden, Beatrice Gardner showed up on the teaching faculty. As far as I can determine, her name is not on any specific classes, but it looks as if the faculty would like to say, "Oh, yes, we have a woman."

A good third of the women in the College of Arts and Sciences are wives who teach one course or two course [s] when they are helpful, and are then forgotten when positions open up. So we have very few visible women on campus. We do have a woman dean, aside from nursing and home ec. The Dean of Students is a woman, which everybody knows is a situation that happened because of some matter of peculiar slipup, rather than necessarily because of a certain choice. And it's wonderful that these things happen.

It is difficult, but the women have begun to make a few noises. I don't know whether the source of the noise is from the women, or whether it is from the federal government, which has said, "If you discriminate against women, we can't give you money." Now, this is rather an ambiguous sort of circumstance. The story is that if a university can be proved to be discriminatory in its treatment of women, its federal funds can be withdrawn. And there was a good deal of publicity given to funds being withdrawn from the University of Michigan and various other important universities. However, rather mysteriously, their funds all got back very shortly, and there's still some question about whether there is really any great intention to enforce the law.

We have formed a women's organization on campus, probably the loosest organization on campus, with a one-page constitution, the Faculty Women's Caucus, which is open to anybody that wants to come. We don't care whether they're faculty—. We originally sent out to women who seemed to be uncovered by the Campus Clerical Association, and not students, who had organizations to work through, but as far as we're concerned, anybody who chooses may come to our meetings, and we're happy to have them. It's a group that's done a lot of snooping around—I don't know much what else. But that's its intention. It wasn't ever trying to be a large pressure group. It is an effort to try to see if the women have anything to say to one another.

I think we have seen the student women's organization somewhat dissolved, though, in the last couple of years. They couldn't decide just quite what it wanted to be. I think Charlotte Morse made a marvelous effort to change it, and to direct it to valid goals, but when she graduated, the impetus disappeared, and this last year, the group has been sort of uncertain about what it is it wants to do. But

I think there is increasing awareness among women on campus of the kinds of problems that exist for them. We have now a committee on women's studies that is attempting to draw up a possible program, and the Commission on the Status of Women, which deals with problems of women.

If there was a rallying point for the year, I think it was the ERA, the Equal Rights Amendment issue, which arose in the legislature early in February—March? March. A number of campus women were involved—students, and faculty, and employees. I think all of us underestimated the power of the opposition and the conservatism of the state. It is one thing to talk about rights for women, and it is another to fight religious teachings. More than that, there was the actual physical fact that the little housewife could leave her kitchen, and her children—though she often took them with her—and go down and beat on the heads of legislators over and over again, whereas most of the professional women, the women who had most to gain from the Equal Rights Amendment, were not free to make this kind of lobbying effort. The result was that the legislators responded to the noise that they heard.

Happiness of Women claims credit for the defeat. I think it was very discouraging for the women to whom equal rights matters. But particularly, what upset me was the attitude of men, because men are the ones who really stand to be helped by the Equal Rights Amendment. What it does is make things equal. If a woman is more capable of supporting the children, she supports them, instead of the man. It does not mean every housewife has to go to work. In fact, the state never has anything to do with anyone's private marriage until something goes wrong. That's the only time that the law enters in, in matters of divorce, of child custody, of child support,

or, for that matter, when there's actual felony within the family. That's the only time the law ever has anything to do with a person's private family. And yet, these emotional arguments were used, the argument that girls would be in the front lines. Well, Britain drafted women all through the second World War. Israel has drafted women as long as it has existed, and yet I haven't seen any destruction of the female in either of these places. There were women killed in England, but there were housewives killed when bombs fell through their houses. But I think that the nature of our country precludes any tender young thing ending up in the front lines. We decide who goes to war. We decided, for example, that far more Blacks and Chicanos would get killed in Vietnam via groups that we assigned there, and I think we would be likely, whether it's right or wrong, to protect our women in much the same way, if we did draft them, if we needed to. But these are issues that became overblown. We heard a great deal about the draft and bathrooms. Our idea of separate sanitary facilities exists because of the customs of our country, not because the law says that we must do it. There—admittedly, a factory must have a restroom for its women if there are more than so many women in a plant, yet it must have a certain number if there are more than so many men. And what label you put on the door is a matter of your custom, rather than the fact that the law stands up and says, "You must."

Many of the things that've been granted to women have, then, become normal for men. Originally, the idea of the fifteen-minute break was granted only to women because they were thought to be weak and unable to exist for four hours, and so many hours at a time. Yet, what happened to that? Instead of it standing in the way of production, it was granted to men, as well. And I think this is true of a good many other things.

But nobody really talked about the *issues* in the ERA— that is, the women who were against it. They worked quite successfully and emotionally against [it]. "Do you want to be our Lord and protector?" which flattered the men, that they were the rulers. I think it might be beaten next time, but it's going to take a while for it.

I went [to the legislature] as an individual and as an educator because we needed a balance. I was amused—perhaps one of the most amusing things that happened this year—that after this testimony, to receive a letter from a member of the administration, saying, "Good heavens! You gave the legislators the idea that there might be discrimination against women at the University of Nevada. Is this so? We are against it. Please let me know if you know of any."

Well, I thought this was highly funny, but I did respond, and pointed out only those things that were a matter of public record, like poor distribution of women [and] the fact that we have never yet [and it's now been almost two years] been able to get a study of comparative rank, salary, and promotion status of men and women on campus. There are still no figures available.

Ruth G. Hilts: They get lost in the computer somewhere?

Or their computer never quite does it. What amused me was that I then got an inquiry from "way up there" about "did I have any figures?" [laughing] And it rather intrigued me that we have had, for example, a lot of publicity about the women's athletic program, which is grossly unfair and unevenly distributed. We've never, for example, dreamed of asking for the same kind of income, for *equal* pay, for women's

athletics. There isn't that much interest in it. We only asked for a *fair proportion*, so that women have an opportunity to participate. One reason that women don't participate in athletics is that they know very well that they pay their own way to this, that, and the other thing, that there are no chances to practice, that they use the dregs and corners of the facilities, and that whatever most of whatever coaching they get is because of the benevolence of the P. E. department teachers—who, by the way, are down to three women—rather than because anybody ever set up a program for them. But I was amused to hear that officially, nobody knew that we had any problems with women.

I see. Do you want to say what part of the administration that came from?

That came from the chancellor. I haven't heard since I've responded. We have made a number of noises, but one wonders whether the noises get anywhere when there are no responses.

I think if I had to summarize the feeling around the campus, both as president of AAUP and as a female very much aware of our circumstances, I would say there's nothing but frustration, which at the moment, is sort of tired frustration, which I think very well might change into anger before long. You can stay frustrated just so long, both as to faculty governance, the attitude of the administration towards the faculty, and I feel the same way about women. They [think], "Oh, well. Ha-ha-ha! Isn't that funny! The girls are getting restless." I have the feeling that less has happened this year, but I have the uncomfortable feeling of there being a sort of steadily growing discontent that may grow into something far less pleasant [laughing] in the next few months.

ASSOCIATED STUDENTS OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA
RICHARD L. ELMORE, PRESIDENT

Richard Elmore: I'm Richard Elmore, and I served during the last year as the student body president for the University of Nevada, Reno, and I've been recently replaced in office by Terry Reynolds in an election that was very disappointing to me. We had approximately 1,100 people vote in that student government election, which is, relatively speaking, the lowest number we've had in many, many years. I think it's interesting to note that the constitutional election, which was held about a month and a half before, drew more voters than did either the primary election or the general election for student body officers. Now, it's curious to note that, and I've spent a great deal of time trying to figure out exactly what it was that caused this thing to happen.

In the exact opposite sense, the constitution, to me, was perhaps what I consider to be my greatest success. It's certainly something that I've looked at for the last three years. We worked on it last year, and, of course, failed to get it passed, and I really, really felt a deep need this year to get a new structure

implemented in student government. I felt that it would be perhaps the only chance that student government would have to get going again, whatever "get going" can mean. We spent an awful lot of time writing the constitution, and there were some rather dramatic changes, and I think we could talk about that for a second.

In particular, the section of the constitution referring to the legislative branch, or the student senate, the number of senators, or number of representatives on campus, was cut from a figure of thirty-five to a figure not to exceed twenty. This, I felt, was important, because I think there were just too many people in the senate. The work was being spread too thin, and you lose the feeling of a personal contribution when you sit in a mass of thirty-five people and bicker about various things. And when you sit one amongst twenty, or one amongst nineteen, or whatever the case is, you feel that your contribution is a lot greater to that group. And I would hope that this feeling would bolster the enthusiasm of the new representatives.

The second thing we did with the senators was to provide for their election on one basis. In past years, we've elected at-large senators, college senators, and living group senators, which were divided into three categories— off-campus independents, on-campus independents, and greeks. The at-large senators and the living group senators were all eliminated under the new constitution. The only provision for election is that you be elected by the college that you're a member of—Arts and Science, Engineering, whatever the case is. The number of seats, as apportioned to each college, is based on population in that college. Arts and Science, I believe, in the new senate, has something like seven representatives—six representatives, somewhere in there. Some of the smaller schools—every school on campus is assured one representative.

Okay. The next thing that we did was that we provided for each senator being able to participate directly in the voting membership of one of the three major ASUN boards— Publications, Finances, and Activities. This is something that's new, and I think will really, really help, from an interest standpoint. It seemed to me that, for the last years, the people who've been most actively involved in ASUN, the ones who've hung on the best, and who've expressed the most interest, have been the ones who've had some voting participation in one of those boards. Up until this year, membership was limited to the at-large senators, and you had twenty-seven senators who weren't involved in any of the board action, other than to approve them every Wednesday night at senate; Under the new constitution, we split the membership of senate three ways, equally, and gave everybody a seat on one of the boards, so that, now, if your interest as a senator is in publications, you can get on the Publications Board and

have an influence there. If it's activities for the campus, the same thing would apply, or finances.

In the executive section under the new constitution, we did some rather big things in the way of programming and budgeting, and we put the executive officers in the position of having to sit down at the beginning of the year and actually formulate some priorities, and to formulate the budget necessary to carry those priorities through. We provided for their publication, so that the students on campus could see at the beginning of the year how their money was going to be spent over the course of the next year. And this is something that's never been done, and in my estimation, with any form of government, should always be done. You can't get down to specifics, but you can talk about priorities, priorities in the area of activities, priorities in the way of publications. If you wanted to implement a new publication during the year, at the beginning of the year is when you should get the input on that out, so that students will have the chance to comment.

We have a general budgeting committee, which is composed of a cross-section of the student government. The executive officers and six senators, two from each of the three boards, participate in this general budgeting function, which will allocate the general fund revenues, as we collect them from the students, to the three boards. And this is important because it gives the president and two vice presidents, with the input of the six senators, a chance to establish where the emphasis is going to be during the next year. We're not flatly dividing \$6.50 out of the twenty dollars every semester to activities, with the remainder standing in Finance and Publications. At the beginning of the year, we're now in the position of saying, "Okay. Here is \$40,000 to publications. Here

is \$60,000 to finances. Here's \$100,000 to activities." Or the emphasis could be changed. And this is something that we've never been able to do. The executive branch of the ASUN is strengthened by having these people put together a budget, and having this budget publicized, and establishing early in the year some guidelines for the ASUN to work by for the next year.

We can talk about the Judicial Council, or the judicial section of the new constitution, which, believe it or not, had some things put in it this year that just about any constitution should always have had before. Under the old constitution, there was no provision for recall of elected officials, and the old constitution's provision for impeachment of officers was extremely vague, so we touched up on that.

There was scarcely anything said about amendment of the constitution, and what was involved in amending the constitution, or an initiative or referendum issue, neither of those were mentioned at all in the old constitution. So there was provision this year for those items. So I think we're a lot stronger from the judicial standpoint, and from implementing change into the constitution, which we now have existing.

In writing the constitution, I used the constitution that Dan Klaich proposed last year quite a bit. We put an awful lot of work into that last year, and I think a lot of the basic ideas were still there. The differences in the legislative branch, and the approach in putting senators on the boards, and that, was completely different from what he offered. In the judicial section, for instance, and in some of the powers of the executive branch, we used a lot of the constitution that he proposed. But it would be a fifty-fifty deal, I think, you know.

Ruth G. Hilts: In what way was it different? I know this one passed; the other one didn't.

Well, that in itself, I think, is an interesting point. One of the criticisms last year, in the effort to get a new constitution passed, was that there wasn't much publicity on the thing—at least, there wasn't much *good* publicity released on it. And the time involved in when it was passed before the senate and the time that it was proposed before the students was awfully short. It was kind of an eleventh hour decision. And this year, we ran it extremely close again, but we had, oh, ten or fifteen days to play with in between in the election.

We had a lot more senators, I believe, behind the constitution this year, and there was a lot more campaigning to get people out. I think the *Sagebrush* did a better job of getting the information out to the students.

This is something that I mentioned last year, something very, very important—we provided for voting in both the constitutional election and the ASUN elections in various places around campus this year. Before, the only place that you could vote would be in the Student Union, and this year, elections were held in all of the major college buildings on campus. We had about seven different polling places. It doesn't answer my question as to why there was a poor turnout for the ASUN elections [there are several thoughts on that] but I think that it had a major influence on why there were more people for the constitution than there were last year.

I think, with the change in the school year, kids were getting out of spring break, and they just weren't ready for the ASUN elections. It seemed like they were happening at such an incredibly early time this year, where, in reality, the dates of the election were only a day different from last year. But I had just loads of kids say to me, "It's too early," you know. "The election seemed so early this year. We're just not ready for it."

I think the campaign, too, contributed heavily to a lower voter turnout, because it was really, in my estimation, a very unexciting campaign this year. Last year's campaign was full of, oh, big issues, and a lot of serious debate about issues on not only the presidential element, but all elements; and this year, it was a very, very mellow, quiet campaign. Nobody got heated up about anything very much. And I think that had its effect in students' interest. There will probably be a lot of kids on campus who, knowing that the new constitution was coming into effect, were taking the standpoint of standing back a little bit, and really see how this thing was going to unravel before they made their contribution in the form of a vote. The fact that the constitutional election was held ten days before the primary may have had its effect, and the kids may have been "elected out" on campus, if that's a possibility.

There was no unrest and unhappiness that was obvious on campus. Maybe no one felt a great need for a spokesman in ASUN.

That could be. This is the first year in some time that there really hasn't been some kind of serious conflict on campus, and for that reason, there haven't been a lot of people heated up about ASUN, and things that ASUN was doing wrong, or things that ASUN was doing right. It's been a very quiet year on campus. I'm not sure that I understand all the reasons for that, other than I see a trend nationally in that regard. The things that've been major issues among student groups for the last couple of years kind of die away. The war, pretty much, was out of the picture this year, and you haven't had that kind of influence. Minority elements on campus, which have been the focus for a lot of attention in the past, were very splintered this year, and

we're trying pretty much to get their people together, to get a group, a nucleus, going again on campus. So, there wasn't any kind of group effort or concern on those regard[s].

Another thing we might talk about, in the way of something that I consider as being an accomplishment, and most certainly was one of the more satisfying things, was this year's student lobby effort before the '73 legislature. I don't think there's anyone on campus who can measure the success or failure, or how much we really got to the legislature, and how much we affected the UNR budget, or the University system's budget, as a whole. But I do think that there was some very keen interest during the year about the legislature. There was concern about the budget, not only on the part of students, and faculty, administration, but concern this year on the part of people within the community about the University's comment into Carson City to supplement what the administration was saying, went, in my estimation, extremely well. There was some very hard work put in by members of the student senate in the form of a report which was done on a college level. The thirty-five senators were broken down into ten teams of researchers, who went to the various administrators of the colleges, and the students within the college, and actually tried to find out what the problems were in the college, and what the money would be used to produce, what things were lacking within the college, and which things need to be improved, and which good things needed to be maintained. We got this input from administrators and faculty within the respective schools, and then we went to the students and we asked them. And the final product of all this research was a report done on a college level, written entirely by the student researchers. All of these reports were put together and bound in one report,

and a copy of this report was sent to every member of the legislature, and the hierarchy of the University system's administration, the regents, and the president, and two vice presidents on campus, as well as the deans of the various colleges.

Now, in addition to this, I spent a great deal of time in Carson City talking to people, and I was included in all of the budget hearings with the governor, and with the two money committees of the legislature. I think that this participation was invaluable. It had really never been done before. I don't think that in any year prior to this there has been such an active campaign on the part of any student groups to do anything.

I knew a lot of the legislators this year in Carson City. When I worked two years ago as an intern under the political science department's internship program, there was a lot of comment at that point about whether or not the students were being given a chance to comment upon their own education and the system that was providing it. And I got that kind of feeling that prompted me to do what I did this year. I believe that we had our effect. It's kinda curious to note that the governor's recommendation and the recommendation of the senate finance committee, at least of this date, were about the best, percentage-wise, as to what we asked for, as to what they were recommending we get, than it's been in many, many, many sessions of the legislature—I would venture to say four or five. And the recommendation of the assembly was even higher than the governor's recommendation by several hundred thousand dollars. And something, this year, was done right, in comparison to past years; it had to be. I don't know where the student input—where we measure on the scale, but at least we can stand at this point and say that we did something this year. There's no one that could say that we

didn't have effect, because I honestly believe that we did.

I'm very much into the legislative process thing, personally, and so it was something of keen interest to me throughout the year, working on this project. I met some good people in Carson City, and in respect to the University's budget, and the University's needs, I really think we saw some responsible legislative action. I'm not sure that I can say that about too many other things that happened in the legislature, an example being the eighteen-year-old majority vote. I'm extremely disappointed, because I see some compromises on the parts of people in Carson City who I thought were stronger. Yesterday's action, in effect, giving eighteen-year-olds all of the responsibilities, but none of the privileges, irritates me to a great extent. I'm a strong believer in eighteen-year-old rights. I have been, before I turned twenty-one and since I have turned twenty-one. Maybe I'm a little more confident in the ability of young people to be informed and to take care of themselves than some of those people were.

We did some things this year in regards to getting the eighteen-year-old majority law passed this year. I personally spoke to several people, and we got letters out, and there were a lot of people who worked pretty hard on this thing. And I don't think it's a dead issue; I think that in two years, we've got a good chance of getting what we lost this year. I hope that twenty years from now, I'm not eating my words now. I really believe, at this point, that we could've done it, and I question the results or, at least, the anticipated results on a lot of peoples' part, I mean the criticism about gaming, and liquor, and kids driving over the state line to party, and that. I think there was a—to a certain degree—a little "white wash" of the whole subject. But maybe it is better that we get part of it now, and part of it in two years.

Something that we might talk about in the form of a disappointment to me this year was the performance of the ASUN Senate. Last year [this is the year before my term as president], I served as president of the student senate, and at that time was actively involved in the problems of the senate. I had hoped that during my term as president I would be able to put the brakes on some of those problems, and this year was every bit as bad as the year before—as bad as the year before that, and the year before that. And that, to me, is the key to a great deal of the problems that the senate experienced this year—a bad legislative section of the constitution to operate under. Problems with size, and problems with people, and problems with attitudes on campus that have been building for three years now, I think, climaxed this year.

It is interesting to note—and there's been a great deal of discussion throughout this year on the number of resignations that the senate faced. It was the highest number of resignations that I've ever witnessed on the part of the senate, but I don't think the whole story of the resignation thing has been told. There were approximately fifteen people who resigned out of necessity, for instance, a change in constituency. The guy was an Arts and Science senator, and was no longer in the College of Arts and Science. Or he was a greek senator, and then became disaffiliated with the greek organization. We had some real problems with two individuals, who, in my estimation, were outstanding senators, were doing an excellent job. One individual felt a certain personal crisis and had to leave school. And the other individual was confronted with a very, very serious financial crisis, which made it necessary for him to go to work, and because of the compromise on his time, and the obligations to a family, this individual submitted his resignation.

Very little has been said during the last year about nine out of fifteen resigning for these reasons. The implication is that fifteen people resigned because they were fed up. And I'd say that number would be closer to six. In looking back at the beginning of the year, when I took office, I would've guessed that six or seven of them—the six or seven who were in for the fun and games of the thing, and were in there to be able to put “senator” in front of their name and claim they were a member of the student senate— would be gone by the end of the year. I think that that estimation was pretty accurate, like the old saying that “the rats leave a sinking ship first.” And that's pretty much the case this year.

The senate had its problems, and I'm very, very confident at this point that the effects of the new constitution will overcome some of those problems. That's the whole plan. I've been to the last two, and the first two, senate meetings of this year, and the change is dramatic. It's a lot easier to communicate, and certainly, communication was a big problem in last year's senate. The interest in the ASUN government, by virtue of participating directly in a board, has bolstered some interest in what they're doing, and I see some people very eager to go to work and tackle some of the problems that students face.

Now, this is something that I'd like to talk about for a minute, because when you talk about the problems that students face, to me, you talk about the role and function of ASUN government. And my perspective, I think, has changed as to what this purpose is and should be. I've been able to see ASUN government function from a legislative standpoint, and now, from an executive standpoint, and I think I've got a pretty good perspective of what you can and what you cannot do. There is no other group on campus, no one other than the ASUN, that

possesses the ability to provide services for the students in the manner that the ASUN does. Without us, there would not be a newspaper like the *Sagebrush*, I doubt; certainly not a yearbook. We wouldn't have a day-care center for parents who wanted to attend school and leave their children someplace at a low cost. We wouldn't have the concerts, the lectures, the movie series that we have, and certainly, the many student groups that come to the ASUN for monetary support would not have any financial backing of any kind if it were not for the ASUN. So I think, from a service standpoint, in providing services to the students, the function of the ASUN, and the role of the ASUN, is extremely important to the students on campus.

Now, when you get to the other side of the coin, and you talk about the things in student government affecting change, and changing some of the more academic things on campus, making a serious contribution into the committee structure that exists on this campus, I see a more shallow role of the ASUN—at least, traditionally, this has been the way it's existed.

To me, the entire committee thing on this campus has gotten tremendously out of hand. I see committees working on the same things that other committees work on. There's a lot of overlapping; there's a lot of frustration. It seems like anything, any change that you want to initiate on this campus, goes through forty committees, who ultimately recommend the same thing, and it gets to the higher levels of the administration, and it's referred back to some other committee. And the process is agonizingly slow. Maybe I'm not recognizing the fact that typically, governmental processes are agonizingly slow. Extremely. I see that as being a big problem with ASUN. You've got students who are on campus for a four-year period, and that's the only piece of the

University action that they see. And so, when they make their contribution for one year or two years, they expect the change to happen while they can see it. Faculty and administration tend to be here year after year after year and accept things with a much "slower" attitude [put quotes around the word slower]. They get to see the final results four or five years later, when the students who initially worked on the thing are long gone, you know, to greener pastures. So I question the ability of the ASUN to make any deep contribution in the course of any one particular year, and expect to see any rapid change during the course of that year, which is kind of the expected thing. Students say we never do anything, and I don't believe that that's the case, because we do so many things that go unnoticed, or get moved into committee and come out in the wash sometime later. And when they get to that point, there's no association to a student government at all, to the point where you could credit the students for having done the thing, or at least having started it.

You get to particular issues, like the issue of athletics on campus which'll come up year after year after year. And this is the third or fourth year that I've been involved with it, and lo and behold, this year, .now, I see some major changes being implemented. And they're changes which reflect student opinion three years ago, and the three years' period since then. And finally, you see these things being done.

So what I did this year could perhaps be measured in this area, well, three years from now. But if you stood back and looked at it on the basis of my one year in office, the 360 days that I was in ASUN government, it'd be pretty hard to tab anything that went in and came out during that time period.

Maybe we could take a minute or two and talk about something that I now see as kind of humorous, which two months ago, was kind of a serious problem, and this is the advertisement which appeared in the *Sagebrush*, which is probably the only really outrageous thing that happened during this year in office. It got us a lot of publicity, and there was a lot of comment on the part of members of the Board of Regents.

And, to me, it's kind of funny, and I look back on the whole thing, and I see a lot of reasons as to why there was such an uproar. At this particular point, the whole community—the University and the community that it's located in, the city of Reno—in my estimation, have a rather temperate existence, at least in respect to advertising of this nature, or movies of this nature, or anything like that. Reno has pretty effectively sheltered, or cornered, the adult book stores in town, and the two major newspapers downtown don't advertise X-rated movies. There's nothing that's on the street that's ever publicized, or, you know, any kind of a publication in this town that ever has anything like this in it. So you've got a lot of people in this particular area [the northern part of the state] who never see this kind of thing, and perhaps found it kind of startling to see it, of all places, in the student newspaper. It's curious, because when I was at a recent Board of Regents meeting in Las Vegas, in every major hotel and casino, and in all of the supermarkets and stores, and on every newsstand on the street, there is an assortment of publications which advertise just about everything. Maybe this is why the concern comes up when it happens on this campus. And maybe that's why there was such a particular objection when the thing appeared in the UNR newspaper.

The student body officers from Las Vegas told me, and they laughed—they laughed at

us, really, for being in such hot water about it. They felt that they could've run the ad without any comment whatsoever. Recently, an ad appeared in a Las Vegas newspaper advertising the movie *Deep Throat*, which has been extremely controversial. And other than one lady in the community writing a letter expressing her concern, there was only about thirty seconds' worth of discussion at the Board of Regents meeting on it, and they passed over it. But for months, now, people have been dragging out the issue of the ad that appeared in the *Sagebrush*, and what we should have done or should not have done in relationship to the people who handled the thing. One member of the Board of Regents felt that the editor of the paper should have been relieved of his position, and the fact that he was suspended from the paper for one week was not sufficient punishment for the thing that he did.

I look back at the *Sagebrush*, and I think that, in five years on campus, this year's paper has been one of the better years. I don't see the problem. I don't see the controversy that has come out in the *Sagebrush* in past years. I didn't see that kind of thing happen this year. I think there was an honest attempt to get a good cross section of opinion, and try and present a different approach to news on campus. And this is one of the things that we looked at when the publications board met to consider what we should do with the editor of the paper when he had appeared. We felt that, because of the personal harm that had been done to him, by virtue of publicity downtown, that the individual had paid enough for what he had done, and the paper had been a good paper throughout the year, and we felt it was important to recognize that fact, and that was the reason for our action.

But it's just kind of funny to me that it would happen here, and not happen in

other places. There was some real concern, and President Miller and I had some rather lengthy discussions about this whole issue at the time that the ad appeared, and I was present at the meeting in Carson City when he had to make the statement.

Did he have to make it?

Well, I don't think that in saying that he *had* to make it, that anybody was demanding that he do it. I think that he felt that, to help the budget as much as we could, that it would be a lot better to make the apology, and hope that it would be accepted and the subject dropped, than to not say anything and let some people batter it around. The editor of the paper wrote a rather lengthy apology, an apology that was distributed to the legislature, and the regents, and various administrators on campus, hoping—you know, expressing the feeling that he had not in any way jeopardized the University's chances at the legislature, or in any other respect.

In a lot of respects, it's been a very frustrating year for me, first of all. I had, really, no comprehension at the beginning of the year about the amount of time that it would take. I've always believed that any job is what you make it, and you could easily get by with a few hours a week, and still be able to do all the other things, and, I'm sure, still be student body president. I think that my interest and my commitment during the last year was harder than that, and it took up an incredibly large portion of my time. And the effect of that was that I got to do some really outstanding things, and I've met some super people, and I've worked with some super people. But it's had its adverse effects, too. I think the effect on me academically has been extremely great. When you're spending at times fifty-two, fifty-three hours a week in the ASUN

office on ASUN-related things, and taking thirteen, fourteen credits, it doesn't leave a lot of time for study. And I think that this is borne out by my track record, academically. This is something that really, really bothers me. I don't feel it'll adversely affect my future career in any way. I think the experience that I've gained from this year far outweighs the disadvantages. But it kind of annoys me, in many ways, to have a record, at least on paper, academically, which does not reflect your ability, or your desire, of what you've learned, or what you've done during the last year. And in that respect, I'm disappointed. In the way of traveling, and meeting people, and learning how to work with people, and relate to a large number of people, I think my experience this year has been invaluable. I feel very good about my year in office, and I think that a lot more has been done and presented than really meets the eye. I'll be interested to see, in two or three years from now, particularly, the effects of the new constitution. I'll be interested to see, two years from now, when the legislature meets again, what things are done in that regard.

It's really curious, you know, for three years, now, I've been deeply committed in student government, and now I find myself in the position of being not involved—at least, not directly involved. I've taken on the observer role, and it's kind of fun. to watch. I don't know what to do with the time that I have now. I spend a lot more time studying. But the difference in roles, from straight student to a compromise between that and student government, is really, really something.

A great, great friend, by the name of Pete Perriera, told me, about two days after the whole thing was over, something that pretty well hits the nail on the head. "As student body president, you're an errand boy." You're

an errand boy for the administration because they expect you to run the student opinion to higher levels. You're an errand boy for the students on campus because they've got a million things that they expect you to do, few of them willing to actually get involved in helping you, but they've got all these things. So you're running around, you're running around, and the end of your year comes, you're not the errand boy any more. They've elected somebody new, but you're not prepared to stop running that hard.

I asked myself at election time if I would ever do it again, and I don't know whether I would or not. I don't know what other experience in my life I could compare it to. I'm glad that I did, and I'm glad it's over. But knowing what I know now, and the effect that it's had on me, on other things which perhaps should have been more important to me, I'd probably do some things different.

ASSOCIATED STUDENTS OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA SENATE
JOHN BRADFORD, PRESIDENT

John Bradford: I am John Bradford. I am a graduating senior this year. My home town is Modesto, California, and I was the president of the student Senate for the last year.

And I think that the first thing that I can talk about is what went on in senate meetings, if we got anything done. I think the thing that got the most publicity this year was the resignation of the majority of the members that were elected in the election last March, and also, the attitudes of the members that were remaining and the ones that were elected after the resignations.

I think that this senate, more than any one in the past, had a real diversity of membership, where we had—I don't like to use the word "red-necks," but I think I can, and other conservatives. We had members of the Veterans Association, and we had a lot of very liberal people that were in there, and I think that with the diversity that we had this year, people weren't—. Most of the members that were elected were in there to do a job and were not elected just to have that at the end of their name sometime later in life, where

they can say they were a member of a student organization.

I think that they questioned the allocation of funds that is given to the ASUN each year through student body fees, and there were a lot of questionings of the finance control board and activities board use of these funds, more than I think there had ever been before, because a lot of people objected to what's happened in the past. I know, when I was in the senate the year before, you would just automatically approve everything that the boards had done the week before. And this year, they really got down where the people were actually questioning why they were spending the money the way that they were. And a lot of times, the things were vetoed, where the senate does have the ultimate sanction on any actions taken by a board. It has to be approved by the senate. And in a lot of times, they did send things back, saying that they did not want money spent that way, or they wanted reallocation of priorities that they were using to spend the money. I can say that there were a lot of negative points about

the senate this year, but this was probably the most positive view, I think, was that we actually questioned things that were going, and I think had a better allocation of money that we had to spend this year because of more student input, where we had completely diverse views on each issue that came up. In the past, almost all the people knew each other, almost all the views were the same, where this year, there were several people who were direct opposites, politically, and, I would say—well, financially, I guess, about spending money, and if you should spend a lot of money or not. I think that this was the biggest positive point that I can point out with the senate, itself, this year.

The big problem that we had was the resignation of members, 'cause we had—I think it ended up that I think there were fifty-eight percent of the total elected group in April of last year had resigned by the end of this year. And part of it was that they—a few of them, I think—found out that they were actually going to have to work, and they didn't want to put up the time, so they decided to quit that way. And there were some other people who were very effective in the group that felt very frustrated because of the slowness of changing anything because of the channels we have to go through, where if we pass a resolution asking to change teacher-course evaluation, or to change faculty evaluations themselves, where students will take an active part in evaluating faculty, it has to go through the Faculty Senate, and it has to go through the University president, and finally, to the Board of Regents, with any University-wide change that we want to see. If we pass a resolution on it, it takes months, or even years, before the slow process, where passing it from one person's desk to the next, when it finally gets there, or gets to the ultimate power of the Board of Regents.

Several of the things we did pass were, I feel, thrown back in our face [laughing] by the Board of Regents, and they said that they were irresponsible. And I think that some of these weren't, but that they—. The attitude of, I think, the student senate and myself [laughing], personally, is that a lot of times, the Board of Regents don't really listen all that much to what students have to say, and that the students are the bottom ones on the totem pole. I don't know how to put it, but where you get opinions from every different group of people in the University community, students are the bottom one. If the faculty or the administration has completely opposite views of what the students want, usually the Board of Regents are going to go with the recommendations of the administration long before they will go with any suggested changes made by the [ASUN] senate, I think. Especially if our changes are directly opposed—or our suggested changes are directly opposed—to administration policy, it's a long fight before we can ever get anything changed, because it is just that the administration comes first, I think.

Ruth G. Hilts: What kinds of things do students, working in student government, want changed?

One of the biggest hassles we had was with raising of dorm fees, and the whole dorm issue, where they were going to close 'em down, and closing down Juniper Hall, raising the fees for the on-campus people next year. And this does not affect all the students, but this was the one thing where we sent resolutions to the president, to Mike Lane, and everybody else, saying that we were directly opposed to this because of financial problems of students, where money's tight, and we felt that if they raised the on-campus fees, or the dorm fees, and they did not relax

their rules for qualifying to live on campus, which, I believe now, it's—you have to be either junior standing or over twenty-one years of age to be able to live off campus, and otherwise, you are required to live on campus. And we felt that if they're raising the fees, they're really trying to get more money out of a captive audience, where, if these kids do have to stay on campus, and they can't afford the money, they don't have any place else to go. I think that this was one of the major issues which [laughing] the whole group agreed on, which was pretty rare, because of the kinds of people that we had in the group. But I think that this was one instance where they just said, "Well, financially, we cannot afford to do anything but raise the dorm rates," but then they also wanted to increase their occupancy. And we thought that this was completely opposed views, because if they raise the rates, then, automatically, fewer people are going to want to live in there. And a lot of people have complained about the conditions in the dorms to begin with, and if you raise the rates, certainly, it isn't going to entourage them at all to stay there. And it finally came down where they said that it was just not financially possible to leave the rates the same because of problems with paying off bonds, I guess to the government, on the construction of the buildings, themselves, and they have so much money that they have to pay Out each year on each building, no matter [how many people are in it]. So this was one of the things where we fought for something and lost.

I'm hoping, with the new constitution, that the group will be able to work better and will be able to effect changes faster than we have in the past. I know that trying to run a group of [laughing] thirty-six people is pretty hard, and the number's now cut down to twenty, so that hopefully, at least, it will be

an easier group to manage. Well, I don't know about less discussion on anything. I wouldn't want to see that. But I think that discussion will not take as long because you won't have as many people debating on any certain issue, so that, hopefully, any recommendations for changes in University policy, or changes in funding, or whatever—hopefully, it will be at least past the student senate faster than it has been before. It won't sit for a month, or something like this, before any action is taken by the group. And if we can speed the process up, farther up the line, I would like to see that. But then, [laughing] whether that's going to be done or not, I don't know.

Farther up the line. Who do you mean?

With the Faculty Senate, going to the administration, and the whole process, the chain of command. It kinda changes.

Hopefully, this'll be a good point, that all of the members of the senate this coming year have not been senators before, except for one person. And there's only one reelected member, which I was kinda surprised at because there were, I think at least four, that were running for reelection, but they were all defeated, except for this one. And I'm hoping—or, at least, I think that this is going to help the transition between the two groups because you won't have so many tryin' to hang onto old ideas, or when they were familiar with the way that the old senate operated, and they might not want to really change, because I think there will be some fairly significant changes in the methods of operation of the senate, itself, because of reduced size. I hope that, because all the members are new, they haven't had any experience with the past, that they will at least have had written proof, or whatever, of how we operated in the past, that they will be able to pick up on their own

and will not have to worry about, “Well, this is what we did before. Don’t we want to do that again?” ’Cause I’ve talked to a couple of the new senators, and they all have been very quick to point out the mistakes or faults that the senate had last year. Most of them were very true, and they were very eager to—well, to discard a lot of operations that we had in the past, and to completely remake the whole senate operation, so that I think the idea is good, and hopefully, that whatever specific methods they come out with in the end will be workable.

But hopefully, because I don’t want to see a drawback in the idea of inexperience, we were—. They had no experience before with making resolutions, who the resolutions have to go to, how to approach the faculty members, or members of the Faculty Senate, with any type of proposal that we have that has to go through that body. And I know that several times last year, new senators wanted to jump in, and they were just going to knock the Faculty Senate over the head, or try to overwhelm them with their arguments on why they wanted to see some certain thing passed. And it really didn’t work, because you can’t go out and go before the Faculty Senate and say, “I want to see this changed,” and have them say, “Fine. We’re going to go along with you.” Usually, their attitude, if somebody comes on really strong, or very hard, very quickly, it’s very negative. So that I’m hoping that a lot of these people at least—of course, this is the initial starting point for them ’cause they’ve only had one meeting, but they’re all very eager to get things done. And I just hope that they don’t go overboard [laughing] with something like this, because they don’t have, except for this one member of the group, [anyone] to caution them at all, about how to operate. And I’m just hoping that they don’t run into this. Whether they

will, time will tell on that one. But this is the only drawback I *could* see with that, that they aren’t experienced with how to approach faculty members, how to go about actually initiating any type of change, and how to follow through on any resolutions that are passed by the senate. As I say, I really can’t tell, right now, whether this will be a problem or not, but I’m hoping that it won’t.

I was amazed with the group, where they were very, you know, “Come on, let’s get stuff done the first meeting,” which—I know, last year, I really don’t think it was the case. But then, a lot of times, initial enthusiasm for the group tends to wear off very [laughing] quickly, because of being frustrated with how long it takes to initiate, and actually see, any kind of change. As I said, if they have the number of resignations we did this last year, they’re going to be in real trouble because of the reduced number of the group, first of all. And then, the way that the new constitution is set up, you don’t have members of the activities board and financial control board elected as such. They are appointed from the senate as a whole, which is a whole, different method of operation for this, and I think it’s a good idea. So each senator has a definite board responsibility, as well as other committees that we have in the senate. And if they have these people—. None of the board members, themselves, actually resigned this last year. They were not the ones who resigned. And I’m just hoping that if any of the people have the same attitude this year about, “Well, I’m in here for a free ride and have something beside my name,” and they do resign, this is really going to hurt the boards, to begin with. And then, from there, this will come back with problems of how we can allocate money. And if they don’t have enough people to operate a board, they’re really going to be in trouble, where, beforehand, all the people

that resigned were just members of the senate and the boards were able to keep operating all the time, because none of their members had resigned. But this year, with each senator being on a board, if they do resign, that cuts out one board member on whatever board he's on, right there, and this could lead to real problems if they have the mass exodus [laughing] that we had this year.

They just can't do it this next year.

Yeah, because if they do, the whole group will be—. We have problems as far as people saying we were ineffective this year, and I think that we were no more—I guess I can get defensive about this—we were no more ineffective than any past group has been. I think we got more things done; at least, I personally believe that. But this next year, if they have any kind of resignations, the effectiveness of the whole group, the senate as a whole, is just going to go way downhill, really fast, because of just not having the people to actually be able to operate. So this is one drawback of having a smaller group. But then, hopefully, you won't have any resignations, and a smaller group is easier to handle, so—hopin' that that'll work.

I think that [laughing] one of the highlights of the year was the scandal with the ad that was run in the *Sagebrush*, and—at least, student opinion within the senate members. don't know about the student body as a whole. But reactions I got from people that I know, and also, the reactions of the senate as a whole, was that it was a very—trying to make a mountain out of a molehill on this thing, and that the students figured that, “Why do you have such an uproar in the state Senate over one column inch of an ad that was put in the student newspaper?” And I think that

the editor of the *Sagebrush* and the business manager, both, resigned, and they publicly apologized for this, and admitted that they were wrong in placing the ad because of being objectionable material to several people, but—.

Did they do it for money, or—?

No. Well, I know that with Buddy Frank, his attitude was that he would run any ad that anyone would—. If they paid for the ad, he'd run it. He solicited ads from people around town, but then if someone sent the ad, and said, “We will pay you to do this,” then he said that he was not going to edit advertising, and this was his philosophy behind it. And I think that you can get into trouble with this, which he did, because somebody [laughing] sending you an ad like this, and you say, “Well, I said that I wouldn't edit anything, so I'll run it anyway,” and you run into problems. But I think that, with something like that, I don't think that, being as much in an uproar as there was, it really wasn't justified, because it was a one-time deal, and it was the only time that it was run. It was run in the paper once, and it wasn't a full-page ad [laughing], or anything like this. At least, I think the legislature really jumped [laughing] overboard. If they objected to it, they could've been discreet with going back through channels, saying, “Why don't you talk to the editor, and since we are responsible, it is a state University, and you are supported by taxes from taxpayers in the state of Nevada, you should not run anything that's going to be objectionable to a majority of the people,” you know, and say something like this, instead of saying, “We want to have him thrown out of school.” “We want the paper stopped.” “We don't even want to see any kind of student publications any more because this is an irresponsible attitude.”

And I think a student newspaper [laughing] is very necessary, for one, and I think that this attitude of saying, "Well, if the students are going to do something like this, we're going to cut 'em off," the students will, number one, be very hostile towards the legislature, which, I think, you know, they're very dubious of, to begin with. But I think that, really, something probably needed to be said to the editor on, "We really don't feel you should run advertising of this type," and should have let it go at that.

Do you think objections from legislators would've been effective if it hadn't been handled quickly and bluntly, as it was?

I don't know. That's really hard to say. I know that there were letters written afterwards from students, themselves, saying they did object to something like this. And there were—I don't know—percentages of pro and con towards the ad, of any letters that they received. But I think that, possibly, something needed to be done in a hurry, well, I don't think, from the students' point of view, it did. I think that student objections to that were saying that, "We don't want to see something like this again," and as long as there wasn't similar advertising, or the same ad run again, they would say, "Fine. It was a one-time deal, and we'll forget it." or they would say, "Well, let's start getting some type of student protest up to get a new editor of the paper," maybe something like this. I don't think there was that big a group of students that were that objectionable to it, to, you know, wanting to get rid of the editor. But I know all of the students wanted to keep the newspaper, and they said that if the legislature wanted to disband the whole idea of a student newspaper, then they would have the whole student body on their back, not just saying, "Well, it's the

hot-headed radicals that are running it, and they're the only ones that want the paper, anyway," which, I think, is very untrue.

And I think that [Buddy Frank] has done as good a job as any other editor of the paper. I think that he's been very fair. He's run all letters to the editor that he has ever gotten. He's never thrown any in the wastebasket. And I think this is a point. I think almost any editors of the paper have done this, because they don't want to be accused of being right-wing or left-wing, and slanting their paper that way, which is a big objection with journalism, to begin with, nowadays. And I think that they were talking to Buddy, 'cause he said that, "I think the editorship of the student paper by administration, or Board of Regents, or whoever, would be very objectionable to all of the student body." There are members of the student body that don't like Ron Jones' column, or, say, Bill Heise's column last year, where these are two differing—you know, two complete opposites on the way that they write their columns. And people objected to one or the other, which is fine. But then, they had the opportunity to read both. And if there was censorship—possibly, if one side was censored, then the other side would say, "Well, we really didn't need that, anyway." But I think that there would always be at least a majority of the student body that would object to censorship, because it would have to be slanted in a direction of some kind. And I think that even people that thought that certain columnists, or whatever, should not be in the paper, I think that they would agree that people should be given the opportunity to read whatever they want to. And I think that the student body, as a whole, really does want a student newspaper. I think if they didn't want a newspaper, there would've certainly been opinions voiced to that aspect long before now. Now, this is because I know

that there has been a lot of controversy over the yearbook, of saying, “Do we want one? Do students really want one any more?”

Do they?

Studies of this, I think that the old bit, where there’s—. Statistics can be bent to show anything you want, and there have been studies done by a couple of different people, and each one has come up with a different saying, you know, different conclusions on whether the students want a yearbook or not. I think, from what I have seen, that, especially with how many yearbooks are ordered, how many students actually pick up a yearbook at the end, that the interest in the yearbook is declining, and student interest, saying, “Well, big deal.” But then, I don’t know—my father always told me this, and I think it’s probably true, that, “You really don’t appreciate a yearbook until several years after you’re Out of school.” You go back, and you can look up something, or look up a person, or whatever. And I think that this, probably, is the real reason behind a yearbook. I think the best idea which has come up so far in the senate, but we had sort of a hung jury on it, never had a real decision one way or the other, was to make—I think it’s two dollars of each student—or, there’s a certain amount of the \$27.50 you pay in student body fees. There is a certain dollar amount of each student’s money that comes out for the yearbook. And depending on the number of students, that’s how much money you have allocated to work with each year for the yearbook. And I think the best idea, which would be very equitable, is to make payment of two or three dollars, whatever it would be, per person for a yearbook optional, and feel that if a Student wants a yearbook, then, fine, they can pay for it. But then, the problem you’d run into here

is if you don’t have enough people pay for it, you’re not going to have it. And I think that if you say that, well, if there aren’t enough students to pay for the yearbook, that maybe you shouldn’t have one. But I’d like to see one. Personally, I feel that it’s a worthwhile thing, but then it is several thousand dollars of students’ money that go into it.

And this is why we never had a real decision on it, is that if only a minority of the students want the yearbook, should we discontinue it? Or should there be a majority rules kind of a thing on this, or what decision?

Whatever happened this year, anyway? The editor didn’t do anything, and he finally was relieved of his job.

Oh, yeah. Frank Poli was—well, I don’t know the whole story behind this, so that I might be wrong on [laughing] some of the facts. But he had missed at least one deadline, that I know of, and he had problems with photographers, and getting any kind of help with the yearbook. He had real problems with this. And then, when he was trying to put the whole thing together, himself, it just was not really coming out that good, so that he ended up resigning. I think there were reasons behind it besides just not being able to handle the job, or possibly getting discouraged and not wanting the job any more. But Maureen Reilley has taken over as the editor for the yearbook, and from what I’ve heard from here, it will be done. I’m not sure if it’s going to be by May, but it will be by fall semester, you know, by September of next year. And with any people who are not here—.

Do graduating seniors get it?

They have it mailed to ’em, which—I have seen it done. Well, at the college I was

at before I transferred here, they did the same thing because of the same problem [laughing], where you keep missing deadlines, and they just won't say, "Well, we can't publish the book on time if you don't get us the material on time." But I haven't seen any of the page layouts, or anything else, on that this year, but supposedly, it looks good, from what— this is second hand information.

I think that, possibly, with the legislature was one area where we actually did something, and were at least partially effective in lobbying, where we had an actual group of people that went down and were talking to the legislators in Carson City and trying to put across the students' point of view on this. And what we did to begin with was, spring semester of last year and the fall semester of this year, put together a whole written document that was a lobby report for each college. And each one of the senators was assigned. It was the college that he had as a major, or if he was elected from that college, we used those people, too. Each group of senators representing that college went to department chairmen, and college deans, and other faculty members— any interested faculty members that would be willing to talk to them—and got their suggestions on what they wanted to see changed, or what they wanted to see increased, especially in the University budget for the next two years. What we did use was almost all input from the faculty, itself, and also, some students' views, by interviewing different students in the college, saying what they object to in the college, and what would they like to see changed, and we tried to edit these enough so that they would be in continuity with something about a budget request, where this was the main area we were working on, with increasing the budget, and what areas—if the legislature would increase

the budget, what areas we would like to see that money spent on.

*Did you feel you were well received by legislators?
Did they listen to you?*

Yes, they did. I was not actually a member of the lobby group, myself, but with talking to several of them, I think that they felt that after we presented this written document, they had written material to go on, where they could say that, "Well, this is what students would like to see, and this is their views on that," where if you had just a group of lobbyists, so to speak, go down to Carson City and say, "Well, we've interviewed the students, and this is what they want," and not have any real, written document on this, I think that it's less effective. And from what I heard, several legislators said that it was a very well-written document, and that the ideas presented were very valid, and that if—well, the whole problem would just be how much money they had to spend, and they were responsible for setting their priorities with where the money was going to be spent, but that they did have proof of student views for the first time. They were very happy to see this, because they said that they'd never had any concrete proof of any student views before, and that if they ever talked to students, you know, each individual would give his own views, but then, except through administration spokesmen, they had never actually had a student view, itself, but just saying they—if the administration would say, "Well, we think the students feel—" in whatever manner they thought, and it was not actually the direct view of the students. And hopefully, this will [laughing] be carried on again, because I think that, whether—what we worked for with an increased budget, we still don't know exactly how effective that was. We presented our views, but then, we

really, except for trying to press certain areas that we felt were very important, it was—. It's up to the legislators to decide, themselves, where they were going to spend the money. And they know student views, they know the administration's views, because they submit the budget.

But this was one thing that all of the student senators, with this lobby report—they did not all go down to Carson City as a lobby group, at all. But all of the whole senate was responsible for submitting this initial, written document, the lobby report that we had. And all of 'em approved this. And each senator could change anything that he wanted to in the whole document, because each department, or each college, submitted their own report, and then each one was given to all of the Senate as a whole, and questions were entertained about changing any of this. And if any of the changes were felt to be valid, they were made. So this was not just one group of the senate submitted one thing for a certain college, which they did do. But then, the whole group had the chance to approve it so that it, at least, hopefully, was the view of the whole student body, we hope, about what was to be done.

How did your student lobbyists feel about the eighteen-year-old majority?

Pushed long and hard. I think they were saying that the whole student body [and I think this is true] is behind an eighteen-year-old majority.

What they passed was a law which gave eighteen-year-olds the majority except for gambling and drinking.

I think that everybody supported the eighteen-year-old vote. I don't think anybody

is going to regret that they ever did this. But I was hoping to see that they'd—well, except it might be years to come, with any other states, though, too, with lowering the drinking age to eighteen. And I think—. As they say, you talk to any administrators on campus, and they said that, God, their problems'd be out the window tomorrow, if they did, because of how much time they have to spend with, you know, "Okay, here's a drinking violation somewhere."

The gambling industry was afraid that the state would get a blacker name than it already has.

Yeah. They legalized gambling, and then they put an age limit on it, and I don't know. At least, in my personal opinion, if they went in that direction enough to legalize gambling all over the state, what's the difference between putting in eighteen-year-olds and twenty-one-year olds?

You can't see that it would be a problem?

Yeah. I really don't think you're going to have just this mammoth tidal wave of eighteen-year-old kids going in to gamble. I really don't think that's [laughing] going to be true. I think it will probably end up, as people have said in the last election, with the eighteen-year-old vote, that they are the same as anybody else. I noticed where there was—I don't know if it was a larger majority than over twenty-one didn't vote, but things like that, where they were saying that the eighteen-year-olds were going to—. Well, there were both sides, where a lot of people said there wouldn't be as big a majority voting as with older people because they didn't feel responsible, or there were others saying that the eighteen-year-old to twenty-one-year-old group was going to make the real difference

in an election. I don't think either case came true, and I think that they found out that from eighteen to twenty-one, the people really don't change that much. I guess you have to set an age someplace, where, okay, "Now, you're reached a majority." But I really think that when, all of a sudden, on your twenty-first birthday, there you are, now you can do anything you want to, where you couldn't two or three months beforehand, I really don't—. But I think that everybody was happy to see—. Well, I think it was kind of a foregone conclusion with a lot of people that at least the voting aspect would pass, because it was a nationwide thing to begin with, and there was very little rope left that people could use for arguments to lobby against an eighteen-year-old vote when it's already a nationwide amendment to the constitution. But a lot of people did work for the passing of the drinking and gambling part of this, I think, because they said that—even a lot of people in the University community did—because of the problems that it would solve with kids in college, where you're not going to stop drinking. There's no way. I think [laughing] unless you put on prohibition, and all that, it just is going to make it a little harder. I really feel, with talking to several administrators, that it would solve a lot more problems than it would create. I assume, if they did pass this, they would end up making drinking legal on the University campus. They haven't been able to in the past, because they said that there's too many people from the age of eighteen to twenty that are University students, which is true.

But the story I was told, talking to some of the guys that were down in the legislature, that the assembly did pass this because they were—you have to go up for reelection every term, and that they knew that they would have to be responsive to their constituents.

And I think, with—especially with—a lot of assemblymen in Reno are elected pretty much by students, because of being in areas where there is a large concentration of students living off campus. And they said that between the two different houses of the legislature, that there is a real difference, where you have your—oh, I guess it's kind of like the House and the Senate at the nationwide level, where they don't have to go up for reelection every year, and they can possibly be a little more independent from constituents than the assemblymen need to be, or are. And this is what I was told. This is the reason why the assembly passed it, and the senate defeated it. And also, because the gambling industry, with feeling both groups Out, found out the assembly was probably going to pass it anyway, no matter if they lobbied against it or not, so they decided to concentrate on one group, and figured the senate was the more likely place that it could be defeated, and they went after it there.

But I hope they will try it again. I don't know if it will ever pass, but I would hope that it would, because I think that when they said that, like if we had a pub on campus, it would be the greatest moneymaking thing in the world for the student body. And people say, "Well, we need to have bigger concerts," or something like this, this would give us the money to be able to do it.

You don't foresee all kinds of problems with drunken students falling in the lake, and breaking windows, and all that sort of thing? Do you think once it was established it would settle down?

I think you would possibly have initial problems with kids, depending on where they're from, coming here and—especially from out of state—that, all of a sudden, that,

boy, you're eighteen years old, say, "Now I can go out and get drunk as many times as I want to." And you're going to have kids like that any time, anywhere. There would probably be some problems. But I think that there are a lot of kids who—I don't know if you can use Mackay Day as an appropriate example, where, most of the time, there is drinking [laughing] on campus whether they want it or not. And except for a few instances—well, I know it got kinda bad last year, but in years past, there has never really been people getting hurt, or property damage, anything like this. There's never really been that big an extent to that. It might be that there might have been more damage than there was other—you know, at other times, other than Mackay Day, but I don't think it's that big a change.

And I know, myself, when I turned twenty-one, my God, I didn't all of a sudden figure that I can go out and drink seven days a week, or anything else. Possibly, yeah, to begin with, you do, when you find out that all of a sudden, something is legal, because it's a little easier to do, except that I think that students would accept the responsibility of it. But if you had a small number of people causing trouble all the time, if it was a repeated group, then, you could—well, number one, the University police could certainly haul 'em downtown, if they wanted to. And I think that other students would really get on their backs after a while.

The idea of students being very quiet this year, compared to, I would say, the last two or three years, I think is very true, and probably, it's just following what, at least, I have heard or read, is probably a nationwide trend, that students are finding that the very visual, vocal protest really isn't doing any good, or it doesn't do any good any more, so that students are finding that if this doesn't do any good,

they're going to have to find another method of instituting change within the university. And part of this, I guess, would be through the senate. Of course, this is [laughing] about the slowest way possible, but—.

How about working through the state legislature, as you did with your lobbyists? Isn't that rather a sensible way to get whatever it is you want?

I think it would be a very sensible idea, but probably, changes that people would like to see are going to be objectionable to legislators [laughing]; I don't know, but it's really something. You always feel—or, I think most of the citizenry of most areas of the United States feel that college communities are on the liberal side of the spectrum, or whatever, and I think that especially trying to make changes that will increase the liberalization of college campuses will be kind of objectionable to a lot of people. And unless you start having changes going the other way, then, they would possibly say, "Fine," you know. "We'll help you out on this."

But the best way that I have seen, with trying to institute change, is somehow, whether through the senate, or whatever, if students want to see change, you've got to go through the administration, where the president—except for the Board of Regents, the president usually has the final say on almost anything that goes on campus. So that if you want to see new programs instituted, if you want to see different types of activities on campus, or anything like this, you're goin' to have to get down to going to the administration with the idea, or else it's going to end up just as an idea, and will stay as such, and never actually become a reality.

Do you find the president easy to get to, to talk to?

Yes. Probably, the majority of the student body, you know, "There he is," often, in the distance, someplace. But with having contact with him, well, he's—this is just because I've been in the senate. Probably, if I'd not been in the group, I would have felt the same way. But you find out, once you get to talk to him, he is a very approachable individual. And from what I've heard from other people, and knowing other university presidents, he is one of the most open with students, and he will support students in almost a majority of any issues that come up, which is, I think, a very admirable trait on his part, where he is willing to stand up to the Board of Regents several times and say, "Well, this is what the students want, and I really think that's the right way to go." And to find a person like this, who is in as high a position as he is, is pretty rare.

I'm glad you found that out.

Yeah. And I found out. I think Rick [Elmore] has probably found it even more, where you can go in, and as long as he has the time, he's willing to talk to anybody on any issue, so that it's a very open door to his office, which, I think, is probably—maybe it's helped, as far as, say, like racial tensions, or any of this kind of stuff. Possibly having the door open has helped to reduce any of this kind of tension.

I haven't heard of any racial problems this year. Where have the problems gone?

That, I think, is a very [laughing] good question. I think the problems are still here—at least, some of them are. They have gotten a black studies program. I have not taken any classes. I don't even know if it's gone uphill or downhill, or how the program is actually working with any of these classes that are

being taught. But I think this has helped with part of the problem. And I think that, with the black students, especially the blacks and the Indians, for two groups, I think that have large numbers of both groups on campus that—probably, most of the tensions are still there, but they aren't being real vocal about 'em in public. Maybe they're trying—. I really don't know because I don't have that much contact with either of the groups. But they, I think, have found out the same thing, where you seize the student body office, that it really isn't doing [laughing] any good, that it's—fine, you may publicize some of your grievances, or what you consider problems on the campus, something like this, but then, for actually instituting change, I really don't think it helps matters at all. Whether it hurts it or not, I don't know. But it doesn't speed anything up, at all. In fact, I think it probably slows it down, especially with the Board of Regents, and legislatures, and all this, where if you immediately say, "Okay, let's sit down and solve the problem," they're going to say, "Now, wait a minute. You're dealing with criminals," or something, if you are trying to deal with people who were arrested for something, and would say, "Now, we aren't going to deal with people like this," and, "We don't want you to deal with people like this," so that if that common attitude came out, then, it would certainly slow things down.

I was wondering if having someone on campus like Harry Wolf, who's in charge of Affirmative Action for women, or for minorities, do the students know that they can go and tell him they have a problem, and it has to be solved?

I have heard of that, but I think, probably, minority groups have known about him, because this is who it was aimed towards, to begin with. They have probably publicized

this fact to these groups. But I think that the old saying is, where a majority of the students really don't know what's going on around here at all. And I think it's probably true, where you ask them about any specific thing, as far as activities, or personalities on campus, or anything such as a person you can go to for problems, or the graduate placement office, or anything like this, that they just really don't know anything about it. And you have to put yourself out a little bit to find out about 'em, usually.

Is it because most students don't need help?

I don't think so. Oh, I think that, probably, they just don't know where to go. And so, possibly, individual problems, or group problems with the dorms, or whatever, they have a problem, but they really don't know who to turn to for the thing, or they have, possibly, an individual go out and dig around enough to find out who they need to go to. But a majority of the students are just here, I think. Yeah, you go to one class, and you go through whatever classes you're taking in a day, and you go home, and as soon as you're off campus, that's the extent of what you're doing at the University. And I think this is really corny, 'cause I know with the student body, we're trying to put on activities, and dances, or you name it, where we keep trying to figure out new and [laughing] exciting things to be able to give the students, to interest more students, in things going on on campus. And you publicize things, you can put up fliers all over the place, and you'll end up with fifty students showing [laughing] up at something. I don't know if it's whether they just aren't interested, or they could care less—which I think, probably, could be the answer.

Or do they have to study so hard that they don't have any energy left?

[Laughing] I don't think that's true at all. At least, I know it isn't in my case [laughing].

There's so much going on all over campus, and yet students will say, "I'm so lonesome," or, "I'm so bored. I don't know anybody. There's nothing to do."

Yeah. You always keep hearing this, especially from [out-of-state kids]. Yeah. They come in here, and say, "John, there isn't anything to do."

I say, "Well, all you have to do is look around."

I don't know. You tell 'em, "Well, you have to look around," but do we need to put something in their face, and say, "Here's what you can do"? And you don't want to spoon or force feed somebody like this, saying, you know, "Here's what we're going to do tonight," [laughing] something like this. You don't want to make stuff required for people to go to.

Do you feel that dorm students, perhaps, are more campus-minded than off—?

Very much so. Yes. And I know, especially when I was in a dorm, I knew ten times more what was—. I wouldn't say speakers, especially, but other activities that're goin' on around campus, I certainly knew a lot more about what was going on here than I do with living off campus now. But this, I think, is possibly part of the problem, that the majority of your students are off campus. And there's very limited means of contacting these people. Where, if you want to publicize something, the only ways that we have, at the moment, are, say, your student newspaper, putting up fliers, advertising around the campus, itself, and unless you put it all over the campus, you're going to miss somebody, because, you know, if you just put it up in the Student

Union, not everybody gets over there. But the only other thing that we have is actually paying for advertising in news media. And a lot of times, for a major concert, something like this, the publicity is put out for that, because it's a city-wide thing, and we want to attract more people than the student body.

But for just campus-wide things that are—. You know, whether they want to limit it to students or not, but it's just open to students and the University community, there is very limited means of contacting people. And if they don't read the newspaper, or if they don't bother to look up and see that there's a sign plastered over someplace, I don't know how you can get to 'em. And I think this is what all the activities vice presidents from the last couple of years have found out, that your concerts are very well publicized, because the people you contract with do most of the publicity on it. And so they will certainly use the news media because they're out to make money on this, where if we're out just to publicize, saying, "Okay, so-and-so is going to be here to speak on a certain subject," you don't want to broadcast this to the city; or, at least, they haven't felt that money put into advertising would be worthwhile. They don't want to spend that kind of money on it. But we really don't have an effective means of communications with a majority of the people. So that you put up stuff in the dorms all over the place, and this is very effective, because if you put up something in the dining commons, kids go by every day, at least once, and they won't see it. But you get people that are off-campus, when they don't eat here, all they do is—. You know, the student union, or anything like this, to reach them, it's a very real problem. I wish I could come up with a solution, but I don't think anybody has yet [laughing].

I don't know of the members of the senate as a whole, but most of the members that I

know at least feel that we're trying to give them as much as far as activities—you know, we're trying to give them as many things to do as we can think up that would be interesting to at least a big enough number of students to be able to make it worthwhile. But geez, you know, you come up with the same thing. Especially with, I would say, older kids, if they are veterans, or something, and you come on campus, and they don't become involved in the campus at all. Some of them will tell you they're here for an education, and that's it. Fine. And, "That's all I want to get out of the University." But I know, with myself, that activities on the campus, or any type of activities in a college community are a very real part of your education, in going to college. And geez, I would feel that if they're just here for an education, and you go to your classes, and that's it, that they're really missing out on a lot of stuff. But, really, with loneliness, and all this, I have, and we have all tried, and drawn a blank [laughing] about where to go from here. And we come up with some new things every year about new activities, and figure that you're going to interest more people in something, but it seems that if you do that, you interest a different group of people than the other ones, and then they feel left out, or something like this.

It sounds like an insolvable problem.

I think that maybe it is. I think a lot of it is the students, themselves, probably. You've got to put yourself out a little bit to be able to get involved in anything, and if they don't want to do that, well, then they're going to get stuck.

You know, I think that apathy is going to be a problem on any kind of a university campus, because—well, I have never heard of, or seen, any campus where all the student

body is really behind anything, except I would say that a lot of people get behind something like Mackay Day up here, more than they do any other things, like Winter Carnival, and all this. And I know that with Pioneer Days at Chico State, they have the same thing, where it's the whole week, where everybody can go wild for a little while, and all of the students can have a good time. But with most activities on a college campus, and any type of politics—or, student politics, I guess I should say, with student organizations—you're always going to have problems finding people really interested in any of this kind of thing, and I think that it's true anywhere. You just don't have that many people that are interested in fooling around with student politics, probably, to begin with, and I don't know any student organization where they can effect change overnight, so that the length of time needed to effect change probably discourages a lot of people, too, but I think this is true anywhere. Maybe I am wrong on this, but any colleges I have heard of, or been to, it's been the same thing.

Just a certain group are interested in student government, and the rest of the students don't care. Is that it?

Yeah, I think so. You have a few students who take an active interest in it, and these end up holding the offices, and this kind of stuff. Not everybody has to be anything, but wants to run for office, because it takes time, and if you want to do somethin' else, then, it's time of f of your program, or whatever.

How much of your time, your active, working energy, does it take to be a student officer?

It depends on the office, to begin with. Something like your student body president,

it's about a twelve-hour-a-day job, because you have to be the representative of the students at several functions. You are always—speaking engagements, anything like this, where, if somebody wants student input on something, or wants a student representative, he is the one that they go to. Also, my job, I think it took more than the normal length of time than your regular senator. But actually, being a member of the student senate didn't take—it took Wednesday nights. You're going to have to give that up, which maybe people have something else they want to do. But then, outside of that, there is not a phenomenal length of time that is needed to do anything. If you're going to be effective, you're going to have to put in some time to come up with legislation, anything like this, that we want to pass. If there's areas that you think need to be changed, or improved, or something, then, sometimes, probably, talking to people, doing the research on the area, so you can come up with legislation that's going to be effective, and—.

How much homework time do you have to put in on a job like this, other than just your meetings?

Well, I would say total time would not be more than—I don't know how you can put a number [laughing] on it, but a couple of hours a week, anyway, where you will possibly put in several hours in a couple of days' time to come up with something, and then you might not do something for a week or two, something like this, so that if you want to average it out, it would come out like that. But it isn't anything like being the editor of a student newspaper, something like this, where they have deadlines to meet, and you have several hours spent before each issue is to come out, by letting out the thing, and all

this. Well, you really don't have the length of time like that, at all. I know, with committee meetings, and things like this that I had, it does take some time. Say you've got a paper to do, or something like this, and it does get kinda tight, where you think, "Oh, my God, I don't have enough hours in the day!"

I think it's pretty rare, where you run into something where you just really don't have the time to do it. I think most students sit around and waste a lot of time [laughing], and I know that it's very easy to do.

I think people, some people, if they're considering running for office, seriously consider how much time they will have to put in, and if they can schedule whatever other things they have to do to fit into that amount of time. But not everybody has to take—. I would hope that people would take an active interest in government, but they don't have to be officers in it, or a member of the—whatever kind of student government setup you have. But my God, at least get out and Vote. And this, we feel, even with the general [laughing] public, is a real problem. And that certainly doesn't take that much time out of your day, to go do that once a year.

Students actually got out and voted this time for the new constitution. Last year, they didn't.

Oh, I think the big reason we did it because we had polling places all over campus, where they had it two different places last time. And we put out a mammoth amount of publicity on this, and we just really pushed it. And that was the whole way that we had to sell it to the students [laughing]. And this is what you have to do with anything where they won't take an interest in it, themselves. You have to really kind of push it into their face, and say, "Now, don't you think this is good?" [laughing], which might be the wrong approach to it, but—.

Do you feel that the new constitution, now, is going to set up a more workable student government?

I will say, on paper, it certainly looks like it, and I do hope so. But time is going to tell on that, about whether it's going to be effect[ive]. I really think it can be ten times more effective than we were, because cutting a few channels, cutting down on, like, the time necessary for doing a lot of things, hopefully, you know, we can put more things through, or can actually get more done. I hope.

Oh, one other thing, with teacher-course evaluation. What happened with it is that we did it last year, and there were the problems. It was all run through the computer, and they had problems in getting computer time. They got all the cards punched, and everything, but it took a mammoth amount of time to run all this stuff through, and get each course out, and all this. And the idea behind it is great. But the problem is that it's going to have to be redone, because just the logistics of the way that the written report was laid out, and how it came out, it was completely unreadable. You had to spend half an hour deciphering everything before you could really figure out what was going on, 'cause all it was, ended up, was just this huge group of numbers on each class, saying, "So many people thought this, so many people thought this," and there was nothing put together by any kind of analysis of anything. Where they gave you numbers on the evaluation, where the form put, "Do you think the course could use something?" and you put "Yes," or you put any degree of "yes" and "no," and five degrees in between, you know, something like this. I forget exactly how it was set up. It was sort of the excellent-good-fair-and-poor idea on rating the classes, I think, in certain areas. Some of the questions were good, and they were valid, but then, there were—geez, forty-some questions, I

think. And the students were getting pretty tired by the time you get down to about the twentieth question on asking, “What do you feel in this area? Good, bad, or otherwise?” [Laughing] And when you get down to there, I think the students a lot of times just started marking it down because they wanted to get through with it.

When it came out, they wanted to have it for the fall semester this year, before the beginning of the fall semester, so that students could actually look at it, and say, “Well, I don’t want this teacher because everybody’s rated him as lousy,” or, “This class sounds pretty bad, and unless it’s required,” you know, “I’ll skip that one,” something like this. But it didn’t actually come out until—I guess it was the middle of October last year.

They actually did get it all tabulated?

They did get it all out, and it was this document that looked about like a *Congressional Record* [laughing], where it was about as big as the oral history from last year, and you just—it was all computer printout pages that they’d bound together, which was fine, but you really had to have it—I had to have it explained to me, on how to look through this thing. And it wasn’t alphabetized by teachers, or courses, or anything else, so that you had to just kinda wade your way through everything to find out what was going on. And I think that, for this reason, not very many students ever even knew that it came out, to begin with. And I think the problem was that if you wanted to print very many copies [laughing] of this, the cost was going to get pretty high.

You need to have somebody—I don’t know exactly what kind of a job you’d call it. But whoever does work on, say, like government reports, something like this, where they cut

it down to size and make it readable and understandable. And, you know, you have to draw a few conclusions somewhere. You can’t just give people numbers. So I think that it needs to be done again. You probably could rework this one and come out with something from classes two years ago, if they wanted to do this. I don’t know if they would. You need to go in with just more than a form with numbers on, and say, “Okay, mark which one you think, and then we’ll just throw it all back at you,” because it really doesn’t make any real sense to any students, and it isn’t usable.

And it has to be current, or it’s not a good tool.

Yeah. Teachers change courses, so far as which courses they’re teaching, and some of ’em might’ve left, you might have new teachers. But the idea, really, of the teacher-course evaluation is great. And I think a lot of teachers—. Well, I think it was pretty funny, when some of the ones who refused to have it done. I’d like to find out just what their reasons were, because what reasons do you have for not having students evaluate a class? I think you ought to give them the opportunity to do it. But maybe you can say, “Well, the students don’t know what they’re talking about,” but fine. You can disregard what the student’s saying, but you ought to give them a chance to say whatever they feel. I forget. It was quite a sizable sum of money that was put into this, and I would hope that it’s going to be done over again, and possibly hire a professional to be able to come up with a deal that we can computerize easily so you can get the results, hopefully, faster than we did this time, and can lay out the whole form, and ask the right questions, so that you can come up with something that really is meaningful to the students and that they can use to make some valid choices of your classes.

I think it gave us a base to go on, by saying, well, they've never really done it all the way through. It had been done once before and had never been completed, so that we did get this done. But then, [laughing] the results weren't very good, but it gave you an idea of what to do.

I just think, as far as getting to the whole of what's happened with the senate this year, that we did do more than has ever been done in the past, with recommendations that we passed. Whether some of these will ever actually come into effect, we have no idea, because it's going to take some time to actually witness what we have done this year. But I think that we did get more done, and that what we did was probably more representative of all the student body than had been done in the past because of the people we had in the senate. But the problem more this year, probably, than ever before, too, was that so many people got in, and they didn't want to put in the time, so you have this mammoth group of resignations that we had, and it's—.

You feel that that was just a matter of they didn't want to put in the time? It wasn't a battle of ideals, anything of that sort?

With a couple of people, it was, yes, where they just got really frustrated, saying, "We can't get anything done, and all these people are against me to begin with. So why not just quit while you're ahead?" But I think the majority of the people I know that resigned, just ended up—well, the way it was set up last year, if you missed three meetings and didn't have a valid excuse for it, we brought impeachment proceedings against 'em. And in all the cases where we started to bring impeachment proceedings, the people resigned. And this was where it came from.

The people just lost interest, and they wouldn't even bother to show up. Some of the people we elected weren't much [laughing] better than the ones that we lost, but I think that we did get at least a more interested group of people later in the year. But this also hurt us with being effective with carrying through on any of the legislation that we passed, because the people who started some of it left.

BOARD OF REGENTS

HAROLD JACOBSEN, CHAIRMAN

Harold Jacobsen: April 10, 1973. This is Harold Jacobsen, chairman of the Board of Regents, continuing to report on progress of the University system, as I see it. The last year has been eventful in many ways, but it hasn't been a spectacular type of eventful year like we've had, say, the last six years.

We find that when the smoke cleared, and elections were over with, that we now have a nine-member board, rather than the eleven members that we'd just gotten used to. The nine members are composed of five from Clark County, two from Washoe County, and two from the balance of the state. In redistricting the [Board of] Regents, they said, they made district three into two districts. The western Nevada area, excluding Reno, is one district, and eastern Nevada is the other district. I represent the district of Western Nevada, and Mel Steninger represents the eastern Nevada district.

Now, we are phasing out so that everybody will have a six-year term, with three regents elected every two years. In other words, there'll always be two-thirds of the board

that will not have to come up for election. I'm sure we're going to get better people running for the board, knowing that they are going to be on there for a six-year term, and we're going to have more continuity on the board if we can have it so that not too many of them come up every two years. Some of them are going to have to serve a two-year term, including the regent who will occupy my position, whether it's me or someone else. Their election comes up next year, and that's for a two-year term. The one in Elko is for six years. Paul McDermott was elected for six years, and so was, I believe, Bucky Buchanan. Louis Lombardi, Dr. Lombardi, comes up for election next year, and that will be for a six-year term. Dr. Fred Anderson holds the other spot, from Washoe County, for six years.

At the [last] general election, two of our regents were reelected by very large majorities, which makes us feel that the people are behind the present board. I'm talking about Dr. Fred Anderson in Washoe County, and Paul McDermott in Clark County. Unfortunately, Paul McDermott didn't live to really carry

out this term. He was reelected vice chairman unanimously at the meeting in January, when we organized the board, but he was ill with cancer at the time, and didn't attend any other meeting.

He was a real loss to the University system because he was the kind of a person who could take a good look at the whole situation and then come up with the right decision. A lot of credit has to be given to Paul McDermott for doing away with much of the north-south schism, because he felt that he was sitting on the board as a Nevadan, and that his first obligation was [to] higher education. He was appointed twice to the board, and then elected, which is probably something. He's the only one that that's ever happened to. And he was elected vice chairman without ever having been elected to the Board of Regents.

He's been replaced by Nedra Joyce, Mrs. Nedra Joyce, by appointment of Governor O'Callaghan. The other new regents are Flora Dungan, and James Buchanan from Las Vegas, "Bucky" Buchanan.

And then, incidentally, there was a bill that—I'm sure it'll become a law—that had to do with reapportionment for the regents. That said that they had to live within their district, and this pits a couple of the regents in Las Vegas against each other next time. In other words, Nedra Joyce and Bill Morris [are] in the same district of Clark County. So if they both run, they'll be running for the same position. I think that's the only conflict. I'm not sure whether Bucky Buchanan lives in his [district] or not, and I don't know what effect that would have on it.

I do know that there is a bill in the legislature that has already passed the assembly, and I can't see but what it would pass the senate, that said it required them to live in their district. There's good and bad points to it. The good point is that it costs less

to run for the board. This is probably a good idea, because it's an expensive thing to do in Clark County.

Now, Nedra Joyce was appointed to serve two more years of Paul McDermott's term, the balance of those two years. Then she will run for the four-year term, I guess. That's right. She'll run for the four, which'll be the balance of his term.

Flora Dungan was elected to a six-year term, and she was elected vice chairman of the board after Paul died. So she is the vice chairman at this point in time.

We haven't had any real problems or campus uprisings at all in the last year. None. There've been some statements made, and some minor problems, but all of 'em were minor. Even our problems of discipline have been almost negligible on both campuses. Maybe we're growing up, or maybe the students have decided that the thing to do is to go to college, and have fun, and prepare for later life. I'm not sure. I'm sure that the fact that the war in Vietnam is over has a lot to do with it. The last couple of years, since Nixon has Vietnamized South Vietnam, the war problem really wasn't any kind of a problem to discuss. Taking its place, however, is, "Should we unionize the faculty?" And that's gotten to be a real problem.

I don't really understand why faculty, at this point in time, would worry about their salaries. We have probably one of the best paid faculties in the country, considering the size of our school and the availability of finances. Our sabbatical leaves are great, [and] sick leave. We provide group insurance. The state retirement plan is very good, and we've also made available the TIAA, which is a special annuity that they can purchase, and we'll handle it for them. Faculty has a say, a very substantial say, in the operation of the

University. Not that they sit on the Board of Regents, but the fact that any time there is any policy changes made, then we bring the faculty in, and tell them of the kind of problem that we're faced with, and that [if] they have problems, and they want a policy changed, they can bring it up through their Faculty Senate. Somebody from each of the four arms of the University sits at every regents meeting. There's always a faculty representative from the community colleges, and from the Desert Research Institute, and from University of Nevada, Las Vegas, and University of Nevada, Reno. So they do have a say. [The students are also represented at the meetings, and they are called upon very often to express themselves.] To give us the views of the faculty, they go through the channels and discuss it among themselves, and they come up with recommendations to us. We don't necessarily—however, we generally do follow the faculty recommendations. But there's many times that policy changes come from other sources, as from administration, or from the regents, themselves.

At this session of the legislature, we were very well treated, as far as the budget's concerned. We got what I believe is necessary. There's just minor differences between the [Assembly and Senate]. The Assembly put in some things that were taken out, and we felt they should be added back in. We were a little bit worried about how much money we were going to [lose] from the national level, and how that has to be replaced by state funds. But as far as funding to provide the kind of education that's necessary in Nevada, we haven't had any problem.

At the beginning of the session, they came up with ideas like, "Let's start a law school," and, "Let's do it without a study." This was led largely by Chief Justice David Zenoff, who felt that we ought to start on a law school,

and he made appearances in Reno, and Las Vegas, and Carson City, went to the Board of Regents, and appeared in several legislative hearings. In addition to that, there were legislators who also took up the idea and pursued it through the same channels, but it came out that they're going to do what the Board of Regents suggested, to begin with, last fall, and that is, they will make a study to determine the feasibility of the law school, and this is the right way to do it.

[Note: the following paragraph was dictated May 15, 1973.]

The legislature passed a resolution requesting the University of Nevada to look into starting a law school on the University of Nevada, Las Vegas campus. They authorized us to go ahead and hire someone who could qualify as a dean to establish the costs of a law school, and how it would operate, requirements, and so forth. However, the resolution was not funded. We're assuming that there's private monies available, and if there are, we passed a resolution at the meeting last Friday, allowing the administration of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas campus to hire such a person if the funding is available. And they will come back with specific recommendations to the next legislature, and if it's feasible, we'll include it in the budget. But it can be removed from the budget. I can't see the school starting before 1976. It'll be the fall '76 [term], if it does start.

Somehow, if you have the need or desire [for] a professional school, that's the only one where you get it by getting the public

sentiment behind you, and getting special backing. The others have to go through the channels, and they have to compete with ongoing programs before they become actualities. One of the things that will happen this year is that we will be starting an architect school on the Las Vegas campus. That's one of the new schools that's going on.

Community colleges have far outdone what was predicted for them—not what I predicted for them—but what we predicted for them otherwise, projected. For example, Western Nevada has about a three hundred percent increase in the last year, and that's a substantial amount. And we have about twice as many students as we have facilities to take care of them right now. So we're doing it by using the [public] schools, and night classes, and so forth. I think I mentioned this last [year]—with the refund from the slot machine tax, we're able to provide two buildings on the Elko campus, and there will be two on the Las Vegas Campus, and there will be one on the Western Nevada campus.

Ruth G. Hilts: Has it been decided yet where the western campus is to be? I thought it was settled for Carson City.

Oh, that's another thing. At the beginning of the year, some of the members of the legislature on the Senate Finance Committee asked if they'd made a mistake in putting the Western Nevada campus in Carson City, and the answer was an emphatic, "No. We did not make a mistake." When the Western Nevada Community College was set up, we had meetings—the first ones were all held in Reno—and there were no sites available in Reno, unless we were going to pay, like a million dollars for them. There was no community backing for it, and there was the problem of having the community college set

up in the shadow of the University and really not getting on its own.

We will be building a building in Reno. But through the efforts of the Board of Regents and the University system, and especially through the efforts of Alex Dandini in the DRI, we were able to acquire a piece of property from BLM, north of [Procter] Hug High, north of the regular campus. We plan to build buildings for the Desert Research Institute, and the first building for the Western Nevada Community College in Reno. So we do have a Campus site in Reno, too. The concept of the community college is that we bring the education to the people. And so, to bring education to the people, you make it available anywhere that you justify offering courses. For example, we offer courses in Lovelock, we offer courses in Fallon, Hawthorne, Yerington, Winnemucca, and any other community that can bring enough students that need the education. That doesn't mean that they have to come to Carson City, or Elko, or Las Vegas to be attending the community college. They can do it there. But we do need some sort of central campus where they put the executive offices, and so forth, and that's what's located in Carson City for Western Nevada.

We will probably change the name—in fact, we have it on the agenda now—to change the name of the Elko Community College to Northern Nevada Community College, because it really does take in more than just Elko. It takes in Ely, and Winnemucca, and so forth. The central campus, of course, will be located in Elko. By next fall, we'll have two buildings there, and so it'll be a real going concern. It'll take another year before we have it here, and also for the Las Vegas one. But a year from the coming fall, we'll have one building at each one of these campuses. The next projection is to put a building in Reno. That would be phase two. Phase three will

be a building in Carson City at the Western Nevada Community College. In Las Vegas, there will be another one on the same North Las Vegas campus. And then there will probably be one at Henderson, or some other spot in Clark County.

One of the ongoing problems on both campuses, and specifically, this year, on the Las Vegas campus, is intercollegiate athletics. It seems like every so often the universities have to decide whether they're going to go out and be big-time athletic schools or not. And you have to be sure that you can finance them, that you be sure that it's not going to hurt the rest of the programs, and to be sure that that's what the people really want.

We joined the West Coast Athletic Conference—Las Vegas and Reno are in the same conference. It's a non-football conference to begin with, but we will eventually become a football conference, too. Their main sport is basketball. The University of Nevada, Reno, has a new coach, [Jim] Padgett, and he did a great job this year. I am especially pleased because we see Nevada boys on the basketball team. Their recruiting is done from the Nevada schools, and this is something I'm sure that the people in northern Nevada want, and I'm pretty sure the people in southern Nevada want, so that they can go [to the games] and know the names. I don't think we need to go to New Jersey, or back East, or somewhere, to find the kind of people that we need to find.

In Reno, we have the Wolf Pack Boosters Club. They raise about \$60,000 a year, and that helps subsidize some of the players, and so forth. I'm not sure exactly how that works, but the money is handled through the University of Nevada, and we are able to put together some pretty good teams. Speaking of '72 and '73, the University of Nevada, Reno, is real happy with the success of their teams. In fact,

they won the competition between the two campuses in both games. They won in football, and they won in basketball. Apparently, this frustrated—or had something to do with the frustration of Las Vegas, because the football coach and the basketball coach had both resigned at the end of the season. We are in the throes now of hiring a basketball coach in Las Vegas, and one of the questions is, "If we're only paying the maximum of \$22,000 for our coach, and he is to receive \$50,000 a year, where does that money come from?" and then, "What control does the University have on it?" These questions will be asked at the meeting Friday [April 13] of this week; it's on the agenda. We're going to ask some specific questions on where we're going, and why we are going in that direction in intercollegiate athletics, especially in Las Vegas. There's some of us on the board who remember back in the 1950's, when we had some real problems with professional-type football players, very expensive, and contracts to coaches that we couldn't afford, especially when we started losing, and couldn't keep up with the costs of operating it. And we finally had to just go clear out of the intercollegiate athletics for a little while, and start all over again, especially in football. This particular time, we're doing it in basketball, but I'm sure that football's next on the list.

The man that we're talking to now, [Jerry] Tarkanian, came from a very large school, a very successful school, and he has had a very successful record as a basketball coach at Long Beach. That's a huge metropolitan area, so I'm sure that the gate receipts are substantial. Now, whether we can justify that kind of gate receipts in Las Vegas or not, I'm not sure, and I recognize that Las Vegas is a much larger community than Reno was a few years back.

But the questions are there. How they're going to be answered, I don't know. I know

that there are regents asking the questions on both sides. Some of 'em're highly in favor of having strong athletes in school so we are known nationally for winning the basketball game, the football game; and some of them put education first. Personally, I put education first. The job of the University is to provide higher education for our young people.

In this session of the legislature, there were three bills introduced on the possible unionization of faculty members. The first one was just to include the University people in the same one that the schoolteachers are in. In other words, they have [an] arbitrator who finally makes the decisions. Arbitration. In other words, the faculty union comes up, and says, "*This* is what we think ought to happen." And the administration says, "*This* is the way it's going to happen." They reach an impasse, and then they bring in an arbitrator, and the arbitrator makes the final decision.

The second one is where they meet and confer, and then they finally make a decision, which is really not too much of anything, I don't think. In that particular case, it's like we do now. *Meet and confer* is what they call it. The faculty comes in with their recommendations, and the administration and the board comes in with their recommendations, and they sit down and discuss it, and they make a decision right there.

The third one was where you meet and confer, and then it gives the faculty the right to strike. That's the one that I think would be the best at this point in time for the University system because it gives 'em an alternative.

I think it would be real bad if it was an arbitration plan because it would take the power away from the people. You vest the power in the person appointed by the governor, or whoever he is appointed by, to make a decision that has to do with the financing of the operation of higher education.

It just can't be the right answer, because you have an elective Board of Regents. And they are elected by the people, and they represent the people. They represent the taxpayer, and they represent the student, and the parents of the students, and everybody else involved in higher education. So if you take the power away from them, I'm not sure, even, it would be constitutionally right, to have an arbitrator make the final decision.

But if the faculty have the right to strike, then that gives *them* an alternative. If they don't like what the Board of Regents or administration have decided after their meeting and discussing it, then they have a right to walk out.

I think what will happen is that none of them will become law at this time. We'll go back to what we've been doing, which I *really* believe is the right thing to do, just not have any unions, because the faculty has fared very well. They have had a say in what's going on. Maybe they don't recognize this, but the Board of Regents has stuck their neck out many, many times to make sure that our faculty is well taken care of. And we convinced the legislature of it, that this is the way to do it. And the legislature has backed us. I've seen the salaries tripled, just in the last few years. We have things like sabbatical leaves. They have sick leaves. We bend over backwards to make sure that they have special fringe benefits. One of the fringe benefits that they have is that they don't pay any fees for their children who happen to be students. They are covered by group insurance, and they're covered by state retirement. If a professor wants to leave for a while, we give them leave without pay. They're granted tenure, which is a real nice benefit, and there's a certain amount of sabbatical leaves allowed each year. So they do have some things that are going for them.

To me, it would be almost impossible—I feel that it's impossible to be a professional, and to be unionized, and have somebody speak for me. Just can't do that. I think that, to have the right kind of faculty, the kind of people we want on our faculty, we have to have professionals. And I can see deterioration in the members of the faculty if they become unionized. I can't say anything else but that. I think that they have to maintain their individuality by being sound professionals, and having people hire them and keep them in universities because of what they can give.

Now, we're real proud of many of our faculty. We have outstanding people. And these people, we take very good care of. Some of them are still employed after their retirement. We keep them for another year on special contracts. We've brought in visiting distinguished professors for a year. These things happen because of what the man or woman, as the case may be, gives. So this is probably one of the big problems that faces us today.

If the situation is good for faculty, as you see it, what is the impetus behind this push for NSP?

I don't know.

I hate to call it a union, but they seem to think in union terms.

They are union. They can call themselves whatever they want to, but what they do is elect somebody to speak for them, hire somebody to speak for them, a full-time person to speak for them, and that's not the concept of being a professional. The concept of being a professional is that you hang out your shingle, and the reason that people come to you is because of the job that you do. I consider myself a professional, and I

wouldn't want anyone else to be bargaining with my employer, or with the way that I got my money, to be sure that I got it. I don't want someone else speaking for me. I want to be able to command the kind of an income that I get because I give the right kind of advice. The same way with a professor—he should command the kind of an income that he gets because of what he can do for the student, and for the general public [because we always have to remember that one of the benefits from a university is the public service that a University offers]. There are certain things that a university can do that no one else can, in the fields of research, education, a place where people can express themselves freely, and so forth.

At the regents' meetings, we have discussed the centennial celebration for the University of Nevada. I believe that would happen in 1974, which is next year. That would be a hundred years since we started the University at Elko. And it stayed there for about ten years, and then it was transferred to Reno. We've set up a committee on the University of Nevada, Reno, campus. They've talked about it in Las Vegas, but the interest is not going to be there, because that particular part of the campus wasn't involved a hundred years ago.

One more thing that maybe I ought to talk about, because it's become a great part of the University, I think, is the College of Health Sciences, which has hundreds of students involved in it, and which will have the first graduating class of the two-year medical school this year. Of the thirty-two students that started, all thirty-two of them will be graduating this year. At this point in time, about eighty percent of them have decided which school they are going to transfer to. And they're transferring to colleges like Colorado, Iowa, Tufts, many outstanding universities. We're going to be watching to

see how they compete with the students who started in the other schools. But actually, I don't think there's any problem. When we had the tests last year—the tests are usually given to the students who've finished the second year of medicine—our students, I believe, six of them, passed the test at the beginning of the second year—not at the end of the second year.

And so, not only in the basic sciences have we done well, but they've done pretty well in the clinical areas for the first two years. Much of the credit for success has to be given to the local medical doctors in the Reno-Carson City area, because they've put in many, many hours of their time, working with the students. Not only just working with them where they go up and lecture in a class; they have the students spend time with them. They take them in where they've seen operations, deliveries of babies, and treatment of patients, diagnosis, and all of that. In addition to that, they put many hours in, just personally helping the medical students. For example, they had a clinic not very long ago, discussing the fact that there is a high divorce rate among doctors. So they talked with the students, met with them, and said, "Let's talk about this, because it's one of the problems we have to face." One of the reasons for this, apparently, is that the doctor's wife has to adjust herself to a different kind of a life, and the doctor does, too. [It's] not a regular, normal family type of living. The M. D.'s have leaned over backwards, really, to make this medical school a success.

We have a contract now with Howard Hughes, and this is with the Hughes Tool Company, so that it's perpetual—at least a minimum of \$200,000 will be paid each year. Although it's not as big as the amount that we talked about originally, that's the minimum, and it's definite. And it's not with

an individual; it's with a corporation, so it's an undying contract. We're real proud of it. The money that comes in for research, for helping to operate the medical school, and so forth, is—our grants have been great, and our private money's been great. And it's getting better.

There was a lot of discussion at the early part of the session of the legislature this year on how the students were selected to go. They were saying there were not enough coming from Las Vegas, in the Clark County area, where more than half the population lives. But as we looked into this a little closer, we found that there were several reasons for this, and one of them was that there were not that many applying. The second one was that the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, had not been offering a premedical school until just the last couple of years. And actually, the statistics show that, for those that've applied, the percentage came out just about right.

Now, we still had some questions, though, on the selection committee, and so we have, now, another special committee set up that is not really the screening committee, but does work with the selection of students. It is composed of a group of people where there are more from southern Nevada than there are from northern Nevada. The final selection [committee] is still made up of people actually connected with the medical school. And this is correct, because those people are not connected with the University of Nevada, Reno, as such, either; they're connected with the medical school. This is the way that we'd be approved by the American Medical Association, the people who approve medical education in the United States. The program is great on that.

And I think that—well, basically, all of our colleges are improving and growing and meeting up with the times. I think we still

have some problems in offering the relevant courses, the kind of courses that we need. I still think that we need to spend more time in the area of knowing China better, the Chinese language, knowing Russia better, and the Russian language, because times are changing. We're not living in the olden days. We're living in today, where the big powers are no longer Spain, and England, and so forth. The big powers are the two communist countries that I just mentioned, and, of course, the United States, and some of its allies. So we need to understand each other's problems. We need to go along with President Nixon's lead in making this one world, and trying for peace in our time. The big reason for the wars is economic. So if we can trade with these people, and understand their ways of living, we're going to do it, and I would like to see the University of Nevada, both campuses, take an active part in training young people to fit into tomorrow's jobs.

I feel that the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, is maturing, too. I think it's been maturing, but I think it's now reached a point where it can really be classed as a full-fledged university. We have just gone through a reorganization, where we have cut down on the numbers of colleges, and we've made the colleges more relevant. A good number of the deans have been reselected, and the setup of the University has been changed—the organization has been changed.

At the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, we've started a new college. It's called the University College, and it's headed by Dean Robert Glennen. The real reason for this is to deal with the freshman students, and, of course, with the sophomore students. There is a general problem, not only in our campuses, but all over the United States, that the counseling that new students get is not up to what it should be. It's not good. One of

the reasons is that many of the professors feel that the first year is just a trial for students, to see whether they're going to be university or college material, and they could care less about them. The second one is that there's so many of them, and they all hit there at once, and many of them have no background, from their parents or from the schools that they went to, as to what they're faced with when they come to a university. And this concept is that we will offer counseling by the kind of people who can do the counseling.

I would like to see them involve students—in other words, seniors, perhaps even juniors, in this. Dr. Glennen doesn't agree with me on that. He thinks that they would get the wrong kind of advice. But looking back on my own college days, I know if I didn't get some of the advice that I did get from some of the upperclassmen, I would've had some real problems, 'cause it wasn't available from the teachers. Well, you can't relate with a professor. You can relate with another student, even if he's two or three years ahead of you. And there's many, many students that need someone their age to talk to. But that will probably happen, because the regents—most of the regents—feel that there ought to be more student involvement. But the good thing about this, we have started this particular college that is there to make sure that the beginning student, the freshman student, finds out what college life is about, what he can get out of college, helps him direct to select the kind of curriculum he ought to take. And if he needs to be transferred from one college to another, why, they can help him to do it. If he needs help in the number of hours he ought to take, and deciding whether he ought to really take a part in extracurricular activities, and so forth, they can do that, too. So their whole time is set to spending *time* with the freshman students.

On the University of Nevada, Reno, campus, we have a very large Arts and Science college, and all of the undeclared students go to the College of Arts and Science. Dean Gorrell has people who assist him, but their [college] is divided up by areas, rather than by the students, and there isn't anybody really there where a sophomore, or a freshman student, especially, can go—. At the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, they do have this particular division, and it's for those people who are just starting. It helps em to decide whether they'll go into business, or which majors to take, and so forth.

And the reason I mention the counseling is because that is the biggest thing that they do, as far as I'm concerned. They help them to make these decisions. They do have a dean that they can go talk to, who is especially concerned with problems that a student has.

In looking back [at] what's happened in the past year, probably the main thing is that the composition of the Board of Regents has changed, so we're back to a more workable sized unit, nine people. The continuity is guaranteed because only one third of them comes up for election each biennium, and two thirds of the board are still there when they reorganize each time. We have taken time to help new regents understand what our problems are. We have done away, for all intents and purposes, with the committee system, where three to five members of the board discussed and made decisions, because I don't think we're that big. We're small enough so that every regent is reasonably assured of knowing what the policies are, and are having a chance to make policy decisions.

Since I've been chairman, we no longer have long, two-day meetings going into the night. Our meetings are generally finished in one day. We spend some time, about ten

days ahead of time, going over the agenda to make sure—. I am very well acquainted with the agenda, and Chancellor Humphrey is very well acquainted with the agenda, so that we can eliminate things that shouldn't be on there. In other words, before an item can get on the agenda, it has to be approved, or there has got to be a recommendation from the division concerned. I've introduced a special item on the agenda that we use all the time, and that's when individual regents have suggested that we just have one item, and they come in and say, "Okay, let's talk about this." Maybe it's about scholarships, maybe it's about transfer of credits, maybe it's about a financial problem. Whatever it is, if the regent has an idea, it's brought up during this particular item on the agenda. If it's found that the consensus is that it ought to be discussed, then it's referred to the particular campus or division involved, and they come back with recommendations, and we act on it next time. Another thing that we've done is [that] any regent, any member of the board, can ask to have an agenda item added, and we add those, too, provided that it's done in time to get the agenda out. But by knowing what's going to be on the agenda, and by telling the people who are going to participate that they have a certain amount of time to make their participation, and to, you know, lay the rules out, and then follow the rules, we've been able to cut the meetings, the length of time, in half. And we've gotten ourselves out of a lot of the administrative problems that we were involved in before.

We have transferred the responsibility, along with the authority, to the presidents. In other words, they can't pass the buck. Now, when a decision comes, it stops, and it's got to be made by the president. We hold the authority, of course, of being able to relieve the president of his duties if we don't think he's

doing the job. And I think this is the way it's got to be done. It's on a much more businesslike basis than it was. By doing it this way, we've also made it so that the Board of Regents do spend a lot more time on policy, and do understand the policy. And when there's changes to be made, they're all involved in it.

The makeup of our board is now, largely, of new people. I think we've only got four out of the nine who've been on there any length of time. The rest of them are all new people that have served two years or less, and when you have that kind of a board, you've got a lot of anxious people that're willing to learn, and I'm sure that they will. I think we have a very fine board, and a pretty representative board.

It's the first time in history we have three women on the board, three women, all from Las Vegas, which may or may not be good. Maybe there should be somebody from the other part of the state. But we do have three women who have different backgrounds. We have a good variety of [people] so that the Whole state, and the thinking of the state, is pretty well represented. [Editor's note: Because of important events occurring after the initial interview on April 10, a second taping session was held on May 15, 1973.] The legislature adjourned, doing practically the same thing as we expected, as far as the budget's concerned. There was a substantial increase in the budget for the whole system, but because there was an actual decrease in enrollment—and certainly not an increase in enrollment—in the University of Nevada, Reno, the increase was not as great as it was for Las Vegas. Also, another factor is that there are many of the employees [who] have been at the University of Nevada, Reno, a longer period of time, so when we attempted to arrive at the twenty-to-one ratio, we came closer to it on the Las Vegas campus. Because of the cost of operations, you know— up here, you have

professors that've been here many, many years, and their salaries are naturally high, and so [it] is more expensive to operate. The ratio is good. It isn't twenty to one yet. It's about eighteen—a little bit in excess of eighteen to one. Maybe it's 18,4, something like that, to one.

Another problem we had with the University of Nevada, Reno—and this doesn't occur on the other campus—was the fact that we have a nursing school, which requires a very high student-faculty ratio, and we have the medical school, which also requires a high student-faculty ratio. There appeared about \$100,000 more in the medical school budget than we had anticipated a couple of years ago, but there was nothing substantial—no great amount. I'd like to point out for the record that the medical school has been, largely financed by grants, and by the Howard Hughes Income Grant. A lot of the faculty that we have there would've been there even though we didn't have a medical school, because we have the School of Medical Sciences. The premedical school is somethin' that's fifty years old, or more, and some of the same people are in both. Another reason why the medical school is very reasonably operated is the fact we have so many doctors in town that give of their time for free.

They donate their services for teaching?

Yes, many of them. Hours and hours and hours. Some of 'em spend, you know, thirty percent of their time up there at the University, and it's all donated., We had thirty-two students that graduated on May the eleventh. All thirty-two of them were placed in very excellent universities throughout the United States. There was no problem in placing any of them, so the success of the medical school has been excellent.

The Faculty Senate and some of the other faculty organizations on the University of

Nevada, Reno, campus acted as if they had not been involved in the process of determining the budget. This is absolutely incorrect. They had representatives, Joe Crowley, president of the senate, and the faculty representatives, at every cabinet meeting. They were involved from the very beginning of the budget building, and they were involved at every decision-making point along the way, so that's not true. And when they made their public statement, which appeared in the *Reno Evening Gazette* [with a picture of the dollar sign and the University of Nevada campus], it was not based on facts. The statements that Dean Knudsen made from the College of Nursing were incorrect. She wasn't basing them on the facts. The statements that the [past] president of the AAUP, Gene Grotegut, made were incorrect. I'm not sure of the exact words that he used, but he said that "You don't base it on dollars and cents" [he wasn't that good at statistics], but he based it on the needs. You can't run a university that way. I said this at the meeting—we have the most efficient system in the United States in calculating what can be done, and how much it costs, and to stay within our budget. We also have probably the best system of communication with the faculty and with the administrators of any system in the United States. So their charges were really unfounded, or based on only half facts. We had an increase in the budget for the University of Nevada, Reno, of 5.2 percent, overall increase. There was a nine .percent increase in faculty salaries. We just changed our method of calculation so that we moved up all ranks' average to a higher position in the national average. We were, before, comparing ourselves with the western states; our goal was fourth place in western states.

At the University of Nevada, Reno, the average salary in 1972-73 was \$15,805. The new one, beginning in July of 1973, '73-'74, will be \$16,790. Now, that's an increase of

6.2 percent. For the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, the average salary was \$14,966, and their new average salary'll be \$16,063, and that will be an increase of 7.3 percent. In other words, the average University professor at the University of Nevada, Reno, got a \$985 increase in one year. The University of Nevada, Las Vegas got a \$1,097 increase. There is still a difference between the two campuses, but that can be explained by the fact that we have people of higher ranks at the University of Nevada, Reno, because it's an older campus. But the difference is narrowing, and in another four or five years, the salary schedules should be almost identical on the two campuses. There'll be some differences, naturally, because of the different courses that we offer. I think that explains it, mostly. I'm sorry that the faculty took the position that they took, but I think that they were not doing it in a responsible manner, because they didn't base it on facts.

Now, it was very difficult for me to understand why the University faculty would stand up and say, "Let's do away with the medical school, because that's what's hurting us." Why should they pick on one particular division of the University? Actually, we're all one big family, and I mentioned it that way, and I think that if one particular school has a problem one year, that the rest of 'em help pay for it. And if the next year it's another one, they should have to pay for it. It could very well be the nursing school more than the medical school, because the medical school really only is \$100,000 difference. The "about \$283,000"—somebody was using the figure—that's not the right difference.

The nursing school could possibly not get some funding federally, but all of our indications are that they will get it, and that the medical school will continue to get the support, so there shouldn't be any problem that way.

For 1973-74, there are no expected cuts. Contrary to what was in the paper, we do not plan to have anybody in undergraduate courses in the nursing school not be able to take courses. That's incorrect. We're going to be able to fund them. They're just going to have to go back, sit down, take another look at it, and find out how to do it. There will be a curtailment in graduate offerings, and there'll be a curtailment in continuing education, but those are new programs.

Overall, I think that we did very well with the legislature for the next biennium. Our operation budget is good, certainly not overly rich, or anything, but we'll be able to operate very well on both campuses and in the community colleges. Our building program, capital improvement program, is the best it's ever been, because we are now on a four-year plan instead of a ten-year plan, something we can really understand. And we have the amount of equal to what comes in from the slot machine rebate, which is \$5,000,000, so that the capital improvements each year stay about that amount. We've even gone ahead, and started some of the plans before we get the money because we know it's on its way now.

The medical school will cost a little bit more this year, because we're going to have to have some more professors. The professors who teach in the medical school are more expensive than the others because they're M. D.'s, you know; and if you don't pay an M. D. at least somewhere near what he can earn in private practice, he's not going to [leave] private practice. He can be a dedicated person, but he won't work for half the amount that he's going to make in private practice. The other professors, even though they're very fine people and have educations, would not be able to command that kind of an income if they weren't in a university, and so the problem of hiring them is not there.

The other thing is the very fact that we're dealing with human lives, both in the nursing

school and especially in the medical school, and we have to have more supervision. You can't have one doctor supervising twenty medical students, because they're working with people. You have three or four students; you have to work directly with them.

Are they actually working in hospitals during this training?

Yes, right. And in the summertime, all but just one or two of them, last year, worked with doctors all summer long. Now, the first two years is basic sciences instruction, but there is some clinical work. The second two years, which is where they're transferring to do now, is in the clinical area. However, our students, last year, took the examination at the end of the first year that is generally given at the end of the second year, and the clinical part was passed—six out of the thirty-two, passed at the beginning, of the second year. They don't have to take [the test] any more. The rest of them will take it this year sometime, and there's no doubt in my mind but that every one of 'em'll pass it. They've just done that well.

Now, let's get back to the twenty-to-one ratio, which is misunderstood. The twenty-to-one ratio was arrived at by cooperative discussions between faculty, administration, and with the state government, the governor's office, and the legislature. The main reason for the twenty-to-one ratio was to hire better people, and to be sure that they were well paid. We wanted to have the professionals receive the kind of compensation they should have, and we felt it was better to have the quality than the quantity. So, with that kind of a professor, we want to make him available to more people.

The Board of Regents was very much concerned with the teaching assistants teaching classes without any supervision, and

so we have directed that that doesn't happen any more. Now, I can't see where that's going to change. After we reviewed what was going on at the meeting the other day, we still were assured by the administration that there would be nearly as many teaching assistants as there were before, and that they would be better paid than they were before.

Another thing that we discussed at that meeting—before I leave it out—was the graduate students, preference for Nevada students versus preference for out-of-state students. It was clearly stated that the policy of the University shall be that Nevada students shall have preference. Nevada students will have preference to go to grad school, but they will be told that there are many, many advantages to going to a grad school at a different college than where they went to undergraduate school.

We also made it clear that the decisions on whether they should be admitted to graduate school or not would be made by the professional people, and not by a secretary, or somebody, that doesn't have that authority. We recognize that it should be discussed, though, and so we were asking the administration to take another look at our policy at this point.

Now, another thing [that] has happened since the original statement was the arrest of twenty some-odd students and two employees at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas campus. There weren't that many of 'em indicted. It was more like about ten that were indicted. There were people there who were not necessarily students, just happened to be on the campus. There were two employees arrested. One of our regents invited the people from the narcotics bureau to come to the University, and to come to the [regents'] meeting at Reno last Friday, and attend a closed session. That was not an invitation from me, as the chairman. And it was the wrong way to do it. It doesn't follow

our manual, and I pointed this out to the regent involved, and asked that it not happen again. Any agenda item has to be approved by the board chairman prior to appearance on the agenda, and we don't want to get involved in any kind of a deal where we have discussion, other than personnel discussions, in personnel sessions. Any chairman that allows this to happen is just asking for trouble, you know. The personnel meetings should include personnel matters and that's all, unless—sometimes, with a specific request, or for some particular reason, like in purchases of real estate, we have to do it that way. For example, if somebody finds out we're going to make an offer of \$108,000, well, they say they'll make an offer of \$109, [000]. You do have to do that sort of thing. We have appraisals that sometimes appear in a personnel session. But with those two general items, that's the only thing that should be in the personnel session. So when we had the meeting, I asked President Zorn to outline what happened down there, and he told us, somewhat similar to what I just outlined. And when I asked Carroll Nevins, who was the spokesman for the narcotics bureau, if he was willing to talk about individuals in a personnel session—that is, our two employees and possible some of the students—by name. He said no, he could not; he was forbidden by law. He said he would like to talk in generalities. And I said, "Okay, if we're talking in generalities, then we have to do it in an open meeting." He said he couldn't do it in an open meeting, so that was the end of the session.

However, there are three particular policy items that need to be discussed in this area. One of 'em is the possibility of double jeopardy of a student that is being tried by the University and by the regular criminal laws at the same time: shall we suspend him, or what shall we do? Shall we suspend the student, keep him out of school when we don't really know whether

we're right [or not]? The second point is, we asked the administration to sit down with the narcotics bureau and ask 'em if there wasn't another way to make their arrests and do their investigations. We feel that at least one person on each campus, or in each unit, and maybe one or two others, should be kept apprised of what they're going to do. We were greatly disturbed. We were unhappy. I, especially, was unhappy to think that they would come in and make a raid on the university campus without telling the president. And yet, they told the press. TV cameras were there. All kinds of reporters were there, and the kids were tried the next morning in the newspaper, which is the incorrect way to do that. And the third point was that we asked the administration to check out and make new policy recommendations to us defining the jurisdictions and the proceedings, and how to handle cases. In other words, how far do the University police go? How far do the city police, the sheriff, and the so-called narcotic authorities, and so forth—how far do they go, and who does what, and how do they cooperate? And we want them to get a more definite policy on that. Again, they were double jeopardy to the students, possibility of suspension, and at the same time, being tried downtown, tried twice; and then there was the cooperation with outside authorities, and the third one is defining the jurisdictions and proceedings.

The University regents were unhappy with the press because of the story that they carried. We questioned the authority that the students had in taking their student body funds to raise the bail for some of the students. It is, indeed, their money, [to] the extent that they raise it, but there is a question of spending it in that manner, because it is money that comes out of student fees, and it's allotted to them to spend. So that will be discussed in more detail, and we'll probably come up with a better policy than we now have on it.

Now, I didn't talk about Adamian, did I? The so-called Adamian affair should be at least reflected upon. My reflections are that the Board of Regents very carefully followed the then University code, [as] clear as we possibly could. We were abused by the press, by citizens, organizations, and many off-campus people saying, "Why don't you fire him?" "Why don't you suspend him?" and, "Why don't you take action faster?" The reason we didn't is because we stuck to the code so that the regents would have a good, clear case in the final decision, whichever way it went. At no time did either of the two regents who were present on Governor's Day, when Dr. Adamian led the demonstrations and did the things for which he was later fired [make any statement]. And even in the hearings, in the final deliberations, they were not allowed to make any statements. The statements were all from those taken by going through the hearings. Actually, for all intents and purposes, and as nearly to the letter as possible, he was tried by his peers, by committees of faculty. The recommendation of whether he was guilty or not guilty was made by the faculty. The only difference was that the faculty said, "Slap his wrist, and if he does it again, then he should be fired." President Miller said, "Well, we'll make it a little bit tougher than that." And the University regents said, "No, the decision wasn't the way it should be: if it's bad to do it next year, it's bad to do it this year," and so that's why he was fired.

Now, two years later, a man appointed for life, the United States district judge, Roger Foley, revoked the action of an elected Board of Regents, and I just don't think it's right. I don't think that he was that well acquainted with the situation, and I feel that it was a wrong decision, and we are going to appeal it. He said the reason that he did it was because of the broadness—I'm not sure of what his words [were] on that, but that because of the wide range of constitutionally

protected activities regulation on which Adamian was dismissed seems unlimited, and by reason of the vagueness and overbreadth, that maybe the regents were right, but the code that we worked on wasn't right. We were following policy defined by Association of American Professors in their code of conduct.

The second point was that he said that the regents were still liable, as individuals. We believe that that will be changed in his final decision, because the final decision isn't out. But we are going to appeal, if at all possible his decision to reinstate Dr. Adamian. And I'm sure that the great majority of the public are behind the regents, and they're unhappy with Judge Foley's decision on that. In conclusion, as far as the Adamian affair is concerned, I hope that the next time we get to court, which will be the ninth circuit court, we'll get a decision that upholds the action of the board.

Another point that we talked about in my original discussion was the possible legislation to allow the University professors to act as a union, or to be unionized. There were three kinds of legislation proposed. The first one was the one that the University professors, themselves, wanted, and that was where they had a right to meet and confer, and then, after the decision was made by the regents, if it didn't agree with the decisions that the faculty had arrived at, they would have binding arbitration. There would be an arbitrator that would hear the case, and his decision would be binding upon the University. The second one was where you just meet and confer—in other words, much similar to what we're doing now, except it was required by law. And the third one is the one that we felt would be the ideal one, and that would be where you have the regular meeting, conferring; you discuss it, and if the final decision made by the Board of Regents [is unacceptable], the faculty would have the right to go out on strike.

There were some compromises or amendments between the three, and it looked like there was a final bill coming through, but then we came to the problem of department heads. Are they going to be administrators, or are they part of the faculty? Well, I believe, and I'm sure that the administration believes—the presidents, and the chancellor—and the regents feel that the department heads have got to be one or the other, and we would like them to be administrators. But if they're going to be elected by the faculty, then they can't be administrators, and represent the faculty any more. *So you've got to go one way or the other.* And this was the point that was being discussed when the legislature ended.

We feel that we have learned a lot. We feel that if this'd come up again next time, that we'll be in a better position to discuss it with the faculty. I still feel very strongly that the faculty don't really recognize what the Board of Regents does for them. We're the people that are over there talking for them. We're the ones that've got their salaries increased many-fold since I've been on the board the last ten years. Chancellor Neil Humphrey, who they sometimes, regard as their enemy, is really their very best friend. He's the one that's in there talking for the University and getting our salary schedules up where they belong, and doing an excellent job of lobbying for the University system.

I suggested just the other day at the meeting, and intend to follow through on this, that as our meetings go along, we'll have meetings with faculty where we can have a real exchange of ideas that maybe hasn't been available through their elected people. Maybe the elected people don't represent all of the faculty, all of the thinking. So what I'm suggesting [is] that maybe we have representative faculty members on each campus and discuss problems for maybe an hour, two hours, each meeting for a while. It's something that's similar to what

we've done in the past, with the deans, and administrators, and different areas of the University. In this one, we'll just be talking about the faculty situation. These meetings would not be bargaining sessions.

Many times, I think, problems that come up, out in the open, are really just misunderstandings, because of lack of communication. I can't see how the faculty don't recognize the excellence of their position now. They do have a say in the operation of the University, a very great say in the operation of the University. If they become unionized, they're going to lose it. It can't be both. One of the real problems is that the faculty are comparing themselves with other professionals. They're comparing a professor's salary with an attorney's earnings. What they seem to not understand is that a faculty professor, when he goes to work, finds an office waiting for him, a guaranteed salary, generally—not always, but generally—a secretary, all paid for. All of his equipment's taken care of. The overhead's not there. Where a professional hangs out his shingle and borrows the money to pay the rent, and buys his equipment on time. And he better produce. That's how he gets paid. And he has his earnings increased by his production, and there just is no such thing as a guaranteed income for professionals. So there is a difference. So if they're going to make a comparison, they should compare themselves with professionals similar to themselves, like other campuses, other universities. There are professionals who work for big corporations, and so their earnings and their fringe benefits can be compared with them. They just aren't in the same spot as the ordinary professional. And that's one of the points that should be discussed with them.

Another one that we should discuss with them in these meetings is how we arrive at salaries and production. This twenty—to-

one. ratio should be clarified. We should sit down again and talk about budget making, and about how the work program evolves, the difference between line financing and the financing the way we do it. All the rest of the people working for the state of Nevada, once the legislature goes home, they're set with their particular funding. That's it. There's no flexibility. The University is still pretty flexible, and where one area needs it, we can put a little more emphasis there.

Another one that I'd like to really discuss with the faculty is getting the real relevant courses, teaching the kind of courses that should be taught at this particular stage of time. I'm talking about shouldn't we now be learning about the customs of—I think I've mentioned this before, but I'll say it again—the customs, and the needs, and the economic situation of countries like China and Russia. Learn their language, so that we can really work with the people who are in control of the world, 'cause that's where a lot of our income's going to be. I think we ought to be spending more time discussing the operations of the world market, and trade with other countries, come to a better understanding of why we have depressions, and why we have inflation. These are the areas where it's the University's duty to be taking a lead in acquainting our young people, because, someday the rest of us [will] retire, and they're taking over in a different era. I know that you and I are living in a different era than our parents did, and it's going to be the same thing with the next generation, and so the University should take that lead.

I'm sure that if we waited another month, there would be many more things to talk about, but that's all that's happened to May fifteenth, 1973.

CENTER FOR RELIGION AND LIFE

JOHN DODSON, CO-DIRECTOR

John Dodson: The past academic year, from the viewpoint of the Center, has been different from the previous years in many respects. I think, primarily, there has been, from our observation, a growing sense of faculty self-awareness, different from the days of student upheaval, but related to it, almost as if the faculty, now that the student crisis seems to have passed, has entered into somewhat of their own crisis, their own upheaval. And, it seems to me, [it] relates to a question of identity of who they are as a faculty, who governs the University, what are the peculiar relationships between faculty and University personnel, what is the meaning of tenure, what is the relationship of academic freedom to the classroom and to faculty power. And although it's not talked about a great deal, I think there is a growing sense of faculty power and an attempt to be as securely in the system as possible, and at the same time to secure as many strengths for the faculty as possible. I think there's a new breed of faculty rising up on the campus, a younger group, being much more aware of the system and how to use it, an

older group somewhat confused and unsure about the way these new people are going, but fairly willing to let them move it.

I think that, also, many more faculty have experienced personal upheaval in their own lives. Our experience would indicate that student concerns with their lives seems to be less, but the faculty families and marriages seem to be more precarious. We see a lot more faculty distress, in some ways, than student distress, proportionately. So it seems to me that that's very much a part of it, that as faculty have had time to reconsider their own lives and what they want, it's also resulted in changes in their family structure. So that's been a new thing to us, something we didn't really expect.

Ruth G. Hilts: Is it new this year, or more noticeable this year?

Yes. In this academic year, it has really been noticeable.

Students, I think, in general, have somehow given up a great deal of responsibility for

school, but they've taken perhaps more responsibility for themselves. I'm not sure that it's good or bad, but they seem to be more concerned with the questions of certification than with the questions of academic excellence. They seem to be more into their own experience rather than really feeling that they can make a difference in the institution. I think their participation is noticeably less. In student government, in informal student government, in the governance of the University, I don't think they really want to be participants in the governance of the University in the same way that they were saying a few years ago.

I don't think that students are any more satisfied with their education than they were, but I think they see it as a means to a different kind of end, so that, you know, you experience a lot of students who just want to get their degree and get Out. And one doesn't sense a great searching for truth, or for, you know, real concern for academic issues. Really, [it's] a concern for how do I get my certification? how do I get my piece of the action? and get on with it.

A means to an end? End meaning job?

Yeah, primarily. But, of course, it's not true for all students, because a lot of other students are moving in a different direction, experimenting with other ways of living, experimenting with new forms of communal life, cooperative life, less concern, perhaps, with financial matters. There's a goodly bunch of those kids. So I think that's a part, part of the reason why we haven't seen as much activism as we have in the past.

I think there's a new religious mood moving across the campus. It's quite obvious that the thing to be is to be religiously—perhaps, from my point of view—fanatic. I think [the] Jesus

movement and manifestations of it are very much there.

It's there?

Oh, yeah, very much there, and I suspect, with the next five years, will be on the increase. I think it's on the increase among the faculty, too, as well as among students.

Is it real theology, or is it a crutch, an easy thing?

I don't know. It's an emotional thing. It's responding to an emotional interest, an emotional need, an emotional response that—that students want. They want something that's more emotional in their life, that gives them some sense of who they are. I didn't sense that among students two years ago. But I think [as] a result of the movement away from responsibility, and movement away from involvement in the University, and movement away from involvement with each other, and movement away from the involvement with studies for the sake of studies, the value of studies has gone downhill. The value of the certification has gone uphill. The value of the grade has gone uphill. Students are really uptight about grades, much more so than they were years ago.

Of the total student body, how many would you say come here to the Center that you get acquainted with, in one way or another? Could you guess at a percentage of the students who take advantage of the Center's being here?

During the regular academic year, about 7,000 people are in the building [each] month for some kind of activity, or some kind of program. I don't know, you know, how much of [those] we have much contact with and how

much we don't. I figure, on an average, I'm fairly closely involved with about a hundred students a year—I mean, realistically, spend some time with them. I know about twenty, and I'm close to about—a few. Maybe it's more than that, but that's just a guess.

There's a lot going on, but in terms of how close one is to students, that's another question. And, you know, for some kids, I think it's a very healing experience. It's particularly noticeable among kids who have been heavy in the drug concern. Religion has kind of replaced the drugs for some kids—for many kids who have been heavy into the drugs. So that's been an interesting development.

I think that's produced a countermovement, too. As some kids have moved into the Jesus movement, other kids have said, "okay, that's really not for me. I don't want to be a part of the Jesus movement. But I wonder what I do want to be a part of? I wonder what I do want to spend my life doing?" so that there's a great sense of searching on the part of a lot of students for something more meaningful in their life. And I think there's a great loneliness, too, a great loneliness on this campus.

More so than on other campuses?

No, I think it's present now everywhere. There's a very real loneliness between students. Students are not—they're really not as loving or supportive of each other, seem to be much less aware of the needs of their own contemporaries, their own friends.

I had a letter from a girl a couple of weeks ago, where she said she wondered if she could come and talk to me, because it seemed like all of her friends came and talked to her. But she had, really, no one to talk to. She felt like killing herself. She just wanted one person that she could trust, and that she could really talk

to about things that were important to her. I think a lot of students are in that very lonely, alienated bag, impossible to feel their way out of. I would say, you know, superficially, I know about five or six hundred students. But, really, working with students, around, probably a hundred would be a [true number]. And then, of course, our staff gets together and talks. Each one of us knows different people, and so we get together and share a lot of ideas.

Frankly, the great question before the University, I think, is, "What is the future of this University?" That's the *real* question. And that, of course, has not been addressed. "What is the direction this University really wants to go in, both for its students, its faculty, and its community?" And we are very seriously thinking that that is a question that needs to be addressed by the whole community and the academic community, together. I think it's a question for each individual person to face, you know, first to decide on their own goals, and what they want to get out of this particular situation, and then it becomes a matter of how do you do that corporately. But the process of deciding on a future of the University is, to our way of thinking, very much in need of discussion.

It has struck us, for example, that the centennial year has not really taken hold. And yet, to our way of thinking, that could've been in the planning for three or four years. But, again, I think it reflects the fact that the University is not sure what it wants to be. It's not sure what its future is, not sure of what its role is in this community and in the state and in the nation. Its image is not clear. There is—you know, it's not even acceptance if there's a pluralistic number of goals, perhaps, that are attracting them there.

The question is centered a great deal on how much money do we have, not on what can we do with what we've got. That strikes

us as an excuse from really being what we want to be. You don't have to have money to be what you want to be. That's only a way of saying, "Now, we haven't really looked at the central question," because money does not determine what we are. It simply determines the extent to which we can do certain things. But it doesn't determine purpose, it doesn't determine vision. And I guess that's what we're really interested in. What vision does the University want to have for itself for the next hundred years, for the next fifty years, the next ten years, the next five years, the next one year? That seems, to us, to be a crucial question, and comes out of, really, the discussions, the feedback, the listening that we've done on campus this year. We'd really like to see the University grapple with that question. I think it's got to be addressed to the Board of Regents, to the administration, to the faculty, to students, to the community at large, to segments of the community. Everybody has a stake in the future of this University. It has to be an educational process as well as a process of feedback. I don't think you can expect people to respond in a vacuum. I think you need to give them something to understand, a place to start from.

I think a good example is the legislature, the fight over the law school, the fight over the medical school—all of those things are political smoke screens to obscure the fact that nobody really knows what they want the University to be, because they fight over little bits and pieces. They really don't have any agreed-upon concept of what is the role of the University in this community. I don't think it exists.

Is there a Center at Las Vegas?

There is now a Center being formed in Vegas, which we call the Center for Religion,

Life, and Peace, and I think they've raised \$200,000 or more to build it. They already have the property, and they will probably break ground there this month. Hopefully, they'll have their new building up by September. We're attempting to develop new staff there, and it'll be an identical pattern to this Center here. We'll be interrelated. And probably, we will form a statewide commission on religion and higher education, which will be made up of people from Vegas, Reno, the smaller counties, and will probably begin to take over direction of the whole program statewide in terms of developing policy and thinking through how to relate to the total system. And hopefully, it will be the kind of a commission that would be on the highest level possible, of people. It would relate to the questions of policy, the questions of funding, and also would speak to the total system about concerns and issues that surround them.

Wow, I'm a little unclear about how these centers are funded. I know they're not officially part of the University system. Is it a community sponsored and funded organization?

Basically, the funding comes from regional sources called United Ministries of Higher Education, which is a funding pot. It's divided up between universities in California and Nevada, from which we receive about \$14,000. We receive about \$20,000 from the diocese of Reno, which is the Roman Catholic bishop. We receive about \$8,000 from local churches and sources locally. We receive about \$4,000 from the Episcopal diocese of Nevada.

It really has become a part of the University, significantly. I think it has created a very comfortable relationship. But we don't receive any funding from the University, except when we do something *for* them, like, you know, we put a dinner on for them, and they pay for

the cost. I mean, it's on a cost, pay-as-you-go basis. The Board of Regents pay money to meet here, and so forth and so on. For Faculty Wives, or for any University group, we charge no fees at all. So any University class that meets here, any University function, any University activity receives no charge. We handle the full cost.

Then the University and the Center are very much related. Do you teach any courses on campus? I know John Marschall does, in history.

John teaches two courses, and I am now presently teaching two full-time courses, but just this year, really. I mean, this year has been different because I joined the health science faculty for a year—actually, for six months. I'm a lecturer in medical ethics in the medical school, assigned to the health science program. And what we've done is to develop an interdisciplinary health care team that is experimenting with new ways of teaching, and new ways of learning. And so I'm a member of the team, which meets regularly and is working out a relationship with Stead clinic, with [the] Public Health Department, with relating students to all kinds of placement in the community. I teach Community Health 102, two sections of that, and then I teach a seminar in Community Nursing 104, which is an interpersonal skills group. Then, I am participating in a seminar on death and dying with interdisciplinary people, and pick up various other kinds of things. I'm doing in-service training for the nurses at Quincy Hospital, and doing a lot of, you know, teaching in classes, kind of on request of the instructor in various ways. I've taught in about two classes this semester for different instructors on specific kinds of issues. And I'm working on a class for next fall, which will be in ethics and health sciences.

So I guess my main interest is in the field of ethics in the field of health care.

I do a lot of counseling, but that's not my main interest. I think one way of talking about it would be "the human values of health education." I've really enjoyed that. It's been a new thing for me this year. It's been too heavy a schedule, and I can't maintain it, but it's been good for six months.

You're forever having symposia at the Center on one subject or another... JD: Right. RGH: ...and I was curious about the interaction between community and the University.

Well, tomorrow, we'll just have finished six seminars on the law, in which we did not primarily involve University people. The assignment was to find academic humanists, who are University people, and have them present to people in the community concepts of the law, and then have people in the community respond to that with either negative or positive response, or however they wanted to. And right now, we're in the process of a rather intensive evaluation of that, and I don't know what the outcome of it's going to be.

What kind of response do you get, say, in numbers and enthusiasm?

Total. Everything we want.

Your groups are large enough so that you feel it's a worthwhile thing?

The program, itself, was funded by the Nevada Humanities Committee, so that it provided us with some financial base to develop the program. And we just received word today—I just got it in the mail today—a

letter from the National Council of Churches, which singled out our program from 250 other programs as being one of the forty model programs in the United States for law and the community. And we were just invited, as a result of that, to New York next month to kind of lay out what the program has been in terms of a model for other places. And we, in essence, were told that the particular program that we had established was, from their point of view, rather worth support, and, they felt, would be exemplary for other institutions to attempt their own projects. So we were rather pleased with that.

We run a lot of those community programs. We think they're doing what we want them to do. They're starting to. But we've done them for about three years, now, and we constantly try to evaluate them.

John Linnan you mentioned as the new co-director of the Center. And John is—"Jack" is what he goes by around here 'cause there'd be too many Johns in this place. Jack is a unique person, who, for the last ten years, has been a professor of theology in Washington, D. C., and was the guiding light behind the development of ten theological seminaries into a coalition of seminaries, sharing [their] program in degrees together. They're ten different Roman Catholic and protestant seminaries in the Washington, D. C. area, and they formed a coalition of which Jack was asked to become executive director, some months after he came here. He's basically a theologian trained in the field of systematics, and this is quite a departure for him, but I think has been an interesting one, different one, for him. His commitment here probably will be over a period of three years. And we really look forward to a tremendous amount of help from him because he's very brilliant and has great skills in many areas—writing, thinking, working with people, developing

program, and so forth. He's an outstanding scholar, a really bright, young scholar. [He] relates very well to the students, and in many ways, he's already influenced us deeply.

It's been a, you know, very difficult year for us. [There's] been a lot of pain, a lot of difficulty. It's very hard to go through the kind of change we went through in September, when John, who was formerly a director of the Center, and a priest in the diocese, comes back as a lay person, trying to find what his new role will be in this operation. Jack, coming to begin his ministry as the director of a facility in which the former director is no longer the director, and John has become the program coordinator, at least for this year. But it created serious strain for the whole operation, and required a good deal of maturity, I think, on everybody's part, to just kind of be able to cope with that. Jack has a way of saying that he keeps telling people he came to the Center in September of 1973, and there is some truth in that, because it's been very difficult to really—. This year we've just kind of put aside as a year to survive in. We are kind of looking forward to beginning in '73 with a different direction.

Jack has helped us a great deal to think through what we really are about, and probably will change the emphasis of the Center programs considerably next year. I think we'll go in a completely different direction than we have in the past four years. We're thinking—right now, still in the thinking stage—we're thinking of canceling all programs, and of giving up the program concept, and instead, begin a process of what we call "prophetic inquiry," or action research, in which each member of the staff, in essence, would be involved in walking the campus to discover what really is happening and where, kind of a new assessment of our full understanding of the University, and not, perhaps, try to be the instigators, but rather,

the enablers of activity and questioning on campus. I think that, maybe, is closer to the new role we begin to see ourselves in. Like, for example, if the question of the University is its future, how do we enable that question to be surfaced? We think that by getting out and doing it, rather than staying here and running a program here, we would move away from here, so that our actions would be in different settings of the community. The building'd still be available for all the things that's being done, but we wouldn't be programming, ourselves, in the same way. So that's a possibility. That's under discussion.

We also are in extremely serious financial difficulty, and that has influenced our decisions a great deal. There's a question about whether we can even go on because of the kind of funding we've gotten, because all of the funding sources, every year, get smaller, but our expenses get larger. We have never asked for money in five years. We have asked no contributions. But this year, we've had to ask for finances.

Does the community respond?

The response was not as good as we'd hoped for. We have fifty people who are donating on a regular basis, which is great, but we had hoped for two hundred people. So we've got a quarter.

Are these primarily University people?

Yes, primarily.

I know the University's aware of the Center, but I wondered if the community at large was.

Some part of the community is, but I don't know how much. We constantly wonder about that, ourselves.

We were amused by the Adamian affair. Of course, we were involved in that whole controversy. And personally, our own personal position is pretty clear. We felt the faculty decision was a wise one, and kind of anticipated that this [court decision, April, 1973] would happen. I think that was shared by many people.

I, personally, had a very close relationship with Paul over the first years that he was here, and with his family, a rather intensive relationship. And I felt that the missing thing in the whole discussion was to understand what was happening to him as a person, and how that related to what he did, and to what the University did, and I think it was an unfortunately overdrawn affair, from my point of view, [causing] needless suffering and distress, when there already was a lot of this sort of feeling of distress.

We do get repercussions of public opinion, in that we oftentimes, during that whole time, we found ourselves pretty much under attack, and oftentimes accused of being a center for fomenting a revolution, and were pretty much under siege for a year, with intelligence agents, and the bugging apparatus, and so forth.

You're not exaggerating?

No, no. It's a fair statement. I'm, if anything, trying to be fairly careful, because the question was pretty intense. Sometimes it was vicious and dangerous. People were afraid, and they looked for anywhere that they could put the blame. They wanted some—you know—"There must be someone who has caused all this." And people'd say, "Well, it's the students from outside." You know, that was one of the big things. They were always outsiders that caused all the trouble. And then it was, "Well, it was those crazy professors, like Adamian," and so forth. And

then, I think the third thing was that it was the Center for Religion and Life. And that was fomented in part by specific groups of faculty who would like to see us conclude our efforts and go somewhere else. I think they had a strange coalition between radical students and conservative faculty served to very deeply attempt to undermine our position. Radical students love to feed to conservative faculty information that the Center was the real cause of problems, which got the heat off them, and gave the faculty the sure feeling that they had all the answers. And it was a very vicious time.

Now, this wasn't only the time of Adamian, the peace movement, and so on? It was that, as well as the time, later, when the Black Student Union had problems?

Yeah. It was that—it was all through, from the beginning to the end. And it involved the police department, and we were quite sure the police department was corrupt, and had a lot of evidence to indicate that, but that's pretty hard to deal with when you're the object of their attention. We had some very serious problems.

But this year's been quiet.

I would say since Kent, really, it's been—you know, in a sense, since the time of Adamian, since January of '71. I'd say since January of '71, we have essentially had very little disturbance. And the pressure, correspondingly, went off us.

We have come to understand that we are subject very much to public pressure. It has nothing to do with what we do or what we don't do. We aren't doing anything different today than we would've done in '69, or '68. We're the same people. You know, right now, we have it very good; a year from now, we may

have it very bad. It depends a great deal on what is actually happening in the community, and what the community needs to use in order to excuse what's happening. While it was very confusing to us the first time it happened, and we felt extremely confused, because we hadn't changed, we knew we weren't any different. Why, then, the fantastic hostility and danger? We were very upset by that, 'cause it seemed to imply that, you know, somehow, we were evil people, and it took a long time to understand what was going on, but it was a very good lesson.

At the same time, it also produced for us long-term and tremendous friends. There were many people who were able, in the midst of that, to also see clearly what was happening, and were able to support us. Without that, we would've gone [under], no question about that.

We hope to develop some real fund raising efforts in the late fall. If we don't, we're in bad trouble. And we have come to a philosophical feeling that, you know, if the community really Wants us, and really feels we're valuable, they'll support us, and we have a responsibility to tell the story. And if we can do that well, then we're willing to live with the decision.

Several churches give us several thousand dollars every year. That's made a big difference to us. And a lot of people still, I think, are very suspicious of us. We seem to pick that up everywhere. A lot of the Catholics are very suspicious. They think this is a place of—. We have people who actively, you know, talk to their students against us, and we have students coming in all the time, upset. They come in and say, "Are you *really* what they say you are?" We have people at Manogue High School who give lectures about us as being evil, and, you know, [we'll] ruin their lives, and undermine the faith, and if there's

one place they should stay away from, it's here. And, you know—that's hard. The high school kids that we know come in and talk to us about at. That's where we pick it up. The people who criticize us don't come over and say their piece.

Someone called us—we were a place of “satanic influence,” because we had a workshop on—what was it? Astrology. That was really hairy. So it's strange to us, the simple things that seem so innocuous, and, really, very unthreatening, turn out to be the most provocative. And the ones that, really, perhaps, we had some question about, nobody else paid any attention to. We've had a lot of encounters with that whole scene.

The Center attempts to be a bridge between the University and the community, attempts to help people meet their own needs in, you know, a variety of ways. I think we try to evaluate all of our programs in the light of those two goals. And they seem to succeed and fail with a, almost unbeknownst to us, rationale. We also have done a lot this year with professional and student workshops—in other words, bringing professionals in the community together with students on the campus who are in the same field. Like this weekend, we have a workshop with Robert McDonald from the University of Washington on family functioning. We'll have twenty students and twenty professionals in the workshop, together, so that there's interaction between the two. And we've got many workshops like that. One of our workshops, the Virginia Satir workshop, was completely videotaped in color, and has been edited, now, into a film, called *People Making: A Family In Crisis*, which will be on the national market within this year, and is an outstanding example of the kind of thing we're interested in doing. We hope to make several films out of that workshop for training at

other universities. Virginia Satir is the family therapist who established contract therapy in the United States. And the workshop with Bob McDonald, this weekend, is another example of the professionals and students—that kind of thing that we're interested in doing.

We've done a lot with issues of controversy. We've hit the abortion issue, we've hit capital punishment, we've hit issue after issue that is really crucial to us, and, we think, to the whole community.

Another thing that's never been done in the state of Nevada before, from the point of view of the churches, is that we published a newsletter, a biweekly newsletter, called *Issues*, which went throughout the whole state to leading community persons, church persons, that documented what happened at the 1973 legislature. And that was kind of an unusual thing. It was the first time that that's ever been done. And at the same time, that necessitated us doing another thing which was quite interesting to us, and that is, we compiled the first mailing list of all churches, protestant and Catholic, in the state of Nevada. And we've now become kind of the center for all of the communication system in Nevada for churches. And that's been a new role for us. We also established, for the first time in the history of Nevada, a meeting of the denominational executives of all churches in Nevada, which was interesting. That was called Demons, which meets here about every two months, which is doing a lot to change the face of Nevada. Those kind[s] of things, probably, aren't too well known.

We also published this year several thousand copies of a document on welfare, about a twenty-page document, which outlines the history of welfare in the United States, in Nevada, and the crisis in Nevada. And very interestingly enough, although many people were upset with us about it, the

recommendations in the booklet were almost adopted unanimously in the legislature. They were not as radical as some were told. Several of the recommendations were adopted. The food stamp program was our recommendation. The FTD program was our recommendation, which we felt—it's FTD, federal aid to the permanently and partially disabled, which Nevada has never had, and many of the things we pointed out in there. Now, the one thing that was not adopted was our recommendation of seventy-two dollars per person for ADC. They went with forty-five or forty-two. But many of the recommendations of the welfare pamphlet were adopted.

And it was interesting that [George] Miller came out and answered it rather vehemently—vehemently suggested that we were well-intentioned, but obviously without the facts. He came out over television and answered us, even though we had just distributed the pamphlet, strangely enough, in cooperation with his division. However, he hit it pretty hard. Nobody has ever refuted anything we've said in that. We documented the Clark County struggle, we documented the Washoe county struggle—in every case, we felt, we documented, as far as possible, the real situation. And the government research newsletter reissued it for us. Then we have put together a thousand packets with information on welfare for a thousand different organizations and people in the state of Nevada, which gave them a whole series of information concerning welfare, things from HEW, things from Welfare Rights, things from the state, things from the community, our own welfare paper, suggestions as to where other materials could be gotten, who were consultants, and so forth. So we put together a resource packet which was used statewide.

We're very helpful in terms of helping people formulate their ideas. I guess describes

what we [do]. We don't see our purpose as telling people what they ought to do, but we do see ourselves as a resource agency that provides for people information that they need to decide what they want to do. We do a tremendous amount of counseling, and that still, probably, is a key resource here at the Center. We do a lot of work. We have, of course, a coffee house that goes on full time, and we have a daily lunch bar that's very popular. It provides health foods for people that they seem to enjoy. We do a lot of musical programming, and dramatic programming, so there's a lot of things like that that go on.

One area I didn't mention that's been really exciting for us this year—we conducted about twelve or thirteen classes in different areas of religion and cultural interest, and that's been highly successful. Even our class in—we gave a class in learning Greek, and thirty people showed up. So, you know, we've been very interested in that, and our class structure has been very successful.

Another interesting program I think we run is called a premarital counseling program, where we have couples coming every night for five nights to be involved in the counseling program. We also did a series of lectures that was kind of fun, called "How to Stay Alive When You Feel Like You're Dead," and that was very successful. We had people like Ron Daly, and Sheila Kohnle, and Jack Clarke from the counseling and testing center, who did lectures on those themes. And we did a lot of classwork in human sexuality. I taught several classes in human sexuality that were a lot of fun, and very good response. So it's been a fantastically full year, a lot of contributions to the community.

COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

ANN PETERSON, CHAIRWOMAN

Ann Peterson: I'm Ann Peterson, the chairman of the Commission on the Status of Women, and on the faculty of the School of Home Economics. This year has been very interesting to me. It was the first time that I served on the commission, and then, to be chairman was a little bit of a start.

From my point of view, the three major things that our commission has accomplished are our revised statement on maternity or pregnancy leave, and, in a sense, stating it as a temporary disability, not something unique or different from other disabilities, not making it a special problem or giving it special status, but treating it equal with other illnesses or limitations.

The second was also written into the maternity leave statement, and that was the child care leave, which is something entirely new for our campus. This allows a parent a semester or a year leave of absence for childrearing needs or problems, where they feel that the child needs special care or special guidance that one parent or no parents at home cannot give the child. They can come

back to work at the same salary step and with the same privileges that they had before they took the leave.

One interesting thing we did, also, with the maternity care leave program is that we introduced for the first time paternity leave. We are a commission for the status of women, and we looked out for the welfare of the men, as well, because, under the same clause, we included paternity leave not to exceed five days, which allows the father the right to request this leave to care for other children that may be at home during the pregnancy or if there are complications that require his being at the hospital with the expectant mother. So, anyway, those are two things, completely new, for our University benefits.

Our objective for the year was to just keep an eye out for any problems that might arise that were specific to the needs of women faculty members, staff, and students, and this is where these two categories arose.

The Affirmative Action statement was approved by our commission and sent forward to the president, and it is now being

implemented by the Board of Regents, and Mr. [Harry] Wolf, who is the compliance officer. It was drafted in the '71-'72 commission, and was finalized this year and went forward. Both the maternity leave and the child care leave have been approved by the Board of Regents. It was done at their last meeting, so these are now official. They had earlier received their clearance by the Faculty Senate and by the academic deans, which is the usual channels that everything has to go through.

The third thing that I think is a real plus that has come Out of this year's work has been the development of the Women's Hearing Board. It was a committee that we decided upon to give women faculty, staff, and female students an avenue for having their grievances heard if they were not able to carry it to their satisfaction on their own. The hearing board consists of seven people. Five out of the seven will hear a grievance, if it goes that far. But the channels that have been set up by our commission and working with Mr. Wolf are that the grievance goes first to his [Affirmative Action] Compliance Office. He attempts to mediate the problem, going back to the two parties involved, getting them together in a more cooperative environment. If this fails to produce the results that the complainant has [hoped for], then they are open to call a hearing committee. Then five out of the seven people on the committee will hear it. If it is a grievance that has human rights overtones, then they have set up the same kind of board, and two of the members will come from the Human Rights Commission, and three will come from the Commission on the Status of Women board to set up their five[-member] committee hearing. Then the recommendations from the committee are given to Mr. Wolf, who sends them forward to the president, and he may or may not wish to take the action recommended by

our commission. But it does give the female faculty member a new avenue for having her problems heard and viewed.

We've only had one grievance go as far as our commission hearing board at this time, and it involved students. We've had, oh, half a dozen faculty complaints that have been able to be settled without calling the total hearing board together. But at least they know that the avenue does exist, and I think that they feel a little freer to express their problems—especially for those women who work in a[n] essentially male department. They have felt a little bit ill at ease in bringing their problems forward.

Mr. Wolf has been an ex officio member at all the Commission on the Status of Women meetings. He's been there to offer us advice on the best ways to carry through any problems that we may have had. He's been a great resource person for us.

I served on the Faculty Senate Athletic [Program] Study Committee. One part of their report that has, I think, a great deal of import for our commission was their statement affirming the great need for more funds to be allocated to the women's athletic program. This was one of the areas where our Affirmative Action statement felt that a great deal of work needed to be done, that some compliance on the part of the University had to be made to equalize the opportunities provided for male and female students. The Faculty Senate Athletic Study Committee more than affirmed this, and this was one of their ten major proposals. It was a rather lengthy report, but they came out with essentially ten concrete things they felt could be done. And I think that this reinforces the Affirmative Action statement, which has asked for the same thing. It will be interesting to see if something is done in that area for the next school year.

The guideline dates, as set [originally, for women's athletics], were all changed this last fall, because the Affirmative Action statement was not completed by last year's commission. So we did minor revisions, changed the time line guides for nearly all of the recommendations which we felt were unrealistic because it hadn't even been presented to the president yet.

The first thing that was to be done gave them a time line of February fifteenth, and that was to review the allocation of funds for female faculty members and allotment of budget, to see if any adjustments could be made. We also recommended that the first staffing position that was filled in the athletic department should be for a female staff member. Again, it will depend on whether there are openings.

One other additional thing that's been of real concern to our commission has been looking into salaries achieved by women faculty members, their rate of promotion once they are hired within a department, the number of female faculty members who achieve department chairmanship and dean positions. We have a subcommittee that is working on accumulating this kind of data so we can see if we do have an area of concern, or if it's just something that we think is a problem. We don't even have the data collected yet to validly make a statement one way or another, but it's something that has been a concern all year, and we have a committee that is working on it. Many of the women feel that once the female faculty member is hired that there is a possibility that she does not receive the same considerations for rapid promotion as the male faculty member in the same position and same department, and so this was one of the major reasons for the subcommittee being formed. We don't have the results back from that, and we probably won't even be able

to compile the information and come to any valid conclusions by the end of this year, and so it's something I hope the commission will continue next year.

I think that just about summarizes our year, to this point. My feeling is that it's been rather a nice, quiet, and kind of productive year. As opposed to last year, I felt this was a very quiet and a very constructive year.

FACULTY SENATE

JOSEPH N. CROWLEY, CHAIRMAN

Joseph N. Crowley: My name is Joe Crowley, and I am here as chairman of the Faculty Senate for '72-'73, with about three weeks to go.

The question of the role of the Faculty Senate has come up from time to time, and it's probably never answered satisfactorily, at least to the satisfaction of all concerned. It came up last at a regents meeting in Las Vegas two weeks ago, in which one of the regents was moved to ask—this was the response to our Athletic [Program] Study Committee report— was moved to ask what business it was of the Faculty Senate to keep poking its nose into administrative policies. He trotted out some other instances of what he perceived to be a faculty intervention in affairs that were none of its business. And I must say the president defended us admirably on that occasion. I indicated to the regent in question that I thought perhaps his definition of what was properly the faculty's business and what was properly not was substantially different from mine, because my understanding of the senate's role was that it had a responsibility

to advise the president of the University on all matters of educational policy, or matters related, however remotely, to educational policy, that it thought to be important, or its business. In other words, its business was almost self-defined. And the president, by and large, seemed to agree with that. And I certainly agree with it! Its role seems to change from year to year, depending on what the problems are for that year, what pressures there are on the University, on the faculty—budget, code, personnel—so it occupies its time in different ways, I think. This year has been a relatively quiet year, and I'll comment on that a little more later. But its role, speaking generally, I think, is to assert and defend the rights of the faculty, and to insure that the faculty has a substantive input into decision making regarding educational policy.

As far as effectiveness is concerned, the senate has had a checkered career. I think if you were to ask that question of my two immediate predecessors, they would say that the senate has not been as effective as it should be, but also, that it has been denied the

right to be effective by administration, and, I think, speaking specifically there, primarily of the chancellor's office, and by the Board of Regents. I guess I would feel a little differently because this has been a different year. As I said before, the last two years—that would be '70-'71, '71-'72—were, really, the critical years, as far as campus turmoil was concerned. That's when all the terrible personnel questions asserted themselves, and occupied the time of senate chairmen, and faculty senates, and discussions with the Board of Regents, and hearing committees, and appeal committees, and so on. And the faculty tended to take a beating right down the line.

I think the last major instance of this occurred at the outset of my tenure as chairman, and that concerned the code, in which, from my point of view, the faculty was beaten over the head with a blunt instrument. An enormous number of hours, and a great reservoir of energy and talent was expended for the purpose of putting together a good, reasonable, responsible code, and when all was said and done, the code we got was one that we had implicitly rejected. The code that we wanted was one that we had voted [both at this campus and UNLV] overwhelmingly in support of, and on the major questions, the most important issues involving faculty rights and concerns, UNLV was in agreement with us. And we got a code that originated in the chancellor's office, and was approved by the principal administrators of the University, and ultimately was approved by the regents. It had what I would consider to be the extraordinary situation of the overwhelming majority of the faculty having expressed its opposition to a code which was put together explicitly to govern it. So we're living under a code that we don't want. I think it's a terrible code, and I think that's the view that's generally shared. And I think that was, really, the linchpin, the

coup de grace, in this period of downward spiral the last two or three years, where the faculty's position of authority had been weakened progressively.

This year, apart from that—I mean, for the academic year, it's been pretty quiet, not much happening. On the small matters, I guess we've been relatively effective. Relations between the regents and the senate chairman have been pretty good. We've certainly had the opportunity to say our piece, although we've lost a couple of fights. There's just not been anything terribly serious. It's probably part of the year that's being experienced all around the country on campuses. There is a kind of withdrawal from incessant preoccupation with activity, and change, and movement, and so on. The great quietness has descended on the campus, and it shows itself both in the preoccupations of the senate, and in the dealings of the senate with the regents. So, it's hard to say, on the effectiveness question. Our effectiveness has been weakened over the last three or four years, and it is possible that, at this point, we can begin to start becoming stronger again, but I'm not sure about that. Too much is problematical to really be very clear about the future.

Ruth G. Hilts: If the findings of the Athletic Program Study Committee are implemented, would that mean your voice is stronger?

Well, that's an interesting question. The athletic program issue, as it has been addressed by the senate, is, right now, really not directed at the regents in any way. That is, we're not asking—with maybe one exception, or two—for any kind of change that would require regents' attention. Most of it can be accomplished at the presidential level. But, it was one of the regents who asked that this report be put on the regents' agenda, although

it was just in passing, and nothing much came of it. So, if we have our way on that, it will be a matter between the senate and the president, largely. So it's hard to judge that in terms of regent-faculty relations, which has been the critical problem, I think, the last three years, together with the deterioration in relations between the chancellor and the faculty. I certainly sense that there is a kind of adversary relationship that's developed there.

[The regents are] always greatly surprised when we say, "nut we haven't had enough input." See, they make this elaborate case that we had all this input. And, of course, we did; I mean, we gave them document after document after document, but it didn't make a damn bit of difference, because [laughing] they rejected all that was really important in our recommendations. Not all—that's an exaggeration, but we lost—we really lost some of the most consequential points. So they can say we had an input, and they did, very courteous, let you get up, speak your piece. They seldom are really manifestly hostile to you, but they just say, "No." I mean, "Thanks, but we don't agree."

On the question of cooperation or conflict between the Faculty Senates at UNR and UNLV—I think there's been a history of some conflict, which is understandable, because of the differential nature of the two universities, and the Understandable jealousy on the part of UNLV for the "good life" that they perceived us as leading up here. And that's reflected in interfaculty relations, and in the conduct of the Coordinating Council [which was formerly in existence to coordinate between campuses], and in the conduct of the Board of Regents in the late '60's and in the early '70's. But I think now that UNLV has come to a position where it's not so young, and feisty, and underprivileged, and [is] beginning

to get a lot of things that it wanted, and some of the perquisites and accouterments that they saw faculty up here as having, and they didn't have, there's certainly not been a strained relationship, at all, this year. In fact, the chairman there has become a very good friend of mine, and on most of the questions of consequence, we've been in remarkably good accord. We've agreed, eventually, on salary, agreed on the code. We both signed a fairly lengthy statement that protested the code, and—well, there've been other issues from time to time. I can't recall anything specifically, right now. But there hasn't been any great tension this year. I think that's a thing of the past, although it conceivably could be resurrected in the future, with the shoe on the other foot. I mean, it could be us looking with great envy on the south. But as of the moment, I would say that's no great problem.

Affirmative Action statements—well, they, of course, were passed through a variety of bodies. The Human Relations Commission, as I recall, [and] for the women, I think it went through the Commission on the Status of Women. They both went through—the minorities' and the women's affirmative action statements went through the senates, were approved, passed on to the president, who, I think, is trying to implement them. As far as the senate's role is concerned, it is hard to comment on that, because we have—well, as an example, we had an instruction to be in accord with the Affirmative Action Statement—or, a request, I should say—last summer, when we put the committees together. That is, the senate executive board is charged with recommending to the president appointments for the twenty-two or -three boards, and commissions, and committees. And so we set down the executive board, which is three males and one female, and

then we got, in addition, three or four other people, so it was a good, balanced group. And we took great care to make sure that women were adequately represented—were more than adequately represented on those committees, and they certainly were. And so I think, at that level, which is where the senate has some direct input, it's working. I know there are problems elsewhere, for sure, but we have not had occasion to deal with them, for the most part.

I understand, now, that there have been some complaints at the legislature about admission to graduate school for women, and that has not been something that's come before the senate, but it's been something that has been discussed in the chancellor's cabinet when I was president, and it's perceived as a problem that needs to be worked on by the higher administrators.

But anyway, we passed the statements, and the senate is certainly in sympathy with them, on minorities, as well as on the women. How they are to be implemented, I don't—[laughing] it's hard to say. It's a good question, and a lot of the answer is tied up in finances at this point. I mean, there's great desire to hire women faculty members, and, certainly, to hire minority faculty members, but there is no money [laughing]. So we'd say it'd probably be a while being implemented—no notable effects, that I've seen thus far. Ultimate effects on the University—one can only say it would be salutary, if the goals are at some point substantially realized. But it's just too early to comment on it. The statements are there, but nothing much is happening.

The recommendations of the Athletic Program Study committee—well, the committee has an interesting history. It grew out of a period of some community excitement a year ago December and January about the University athletic program. There

was a kind of exposé—I hope that's not too strong a word—in the press, a four-part series, that dissected the athletic program, and said some not nice things about it. At the time of the Black student sit-in, a lot of Black athletes were suspended, and there was a great to-do about that. There was a half-page ad taken out by a student, in the newspaper, in which he detailed this indictment of the athletic program. So there was abundant concern, and the Senate took it up. It's one of those questions that you would not—if you were preparing a list of explicit responsibilities of the senate, you maybe wouldn't put that down, but it's within the senate's bailiwick. The kind of question that the regents referred to earlier, in which they stated it was none of our business.

Well, it *was* our business, and so we did appoint an ad hoc committee, and did take care in determining its membership. It was very well-balanced, had a former athletic director and coach, had a former athlete who is black, and the only person in the senate who voted against the inquiry was a member. The person who initiated the inquiry was a member. I can't remember who else. The chairman is an extraordinary fellow named John Marschall. And it's the hardest working committee I ever saw in my life. They just really put in the time. And it was a very good report, very thoughtful, and very cautious, I think, recommending some changes that would be helpful. Almost the entirety of the recommendations were endorsed by the senate, with some semantical changes.

The ultimate effects—if the president endorses the senate's endorsement—I think, will be a better athletic program, a better control exercised by the University community, the faculty and students, Over the program, a greater shake for women, a better shake for the athletes, and a better shake for

the students. One does not want to be overly optimistic about such things. I don't mean that radical changes are portended by the report, but significant changes are, and I think they would be very helpful to the campus community.

The "recurring question of compulsory ROTC" is indeed recurring, and has just recurred at the senate about three weeks ago, as I recall. We've been through this fight now, I don't remember how many times—three, in my recollection. Two times, there's been a ballot of the full faculty; on every occasion, ultimate defeat, although certainly, the change in the character of compulsory ROTC that was initiated several years ago was progress, I think. Students can come in and go through an intensive couple-day short course, and satisfy the requirement. But still, it's compulsory.

Well, it came before us again this year. I was certainly tired of fighting this battle, and saw it as useless if we did it in the same old way. So this year, the senate has, with the promise of cooperation on the part of the professor of military science—that is, the head of the program—the Military Affairs Review Board agreed to put together a proposal under which ROTC could continue as a viable program without being compulsory. So we voted to request an end in the compulsory ROTC at that point when such a viable program can be assembled. I think it's the only way in which the regents are ever going to approve an end to compulsory ROTC. So I would see that as being the—if there is good cooperation all around—and that requires not just the Senate, Military Affairs Review Board, and the ROTC department, but a lot of colleges and departments on campus who've been historically and traditionally suspicious of ROTC, they're going to have to sit down and talk. If that can get done, I would think,

sometime reasonably early next year, that the recommendation could go to the regents, and assuming it's approved by the faculty, I think it would be.

Other notable problems this year—well, it's been a quiet year. I spoke about the code earlier. That was certainly the most notable, the most grievous, the most disappointing. Most of the rest of the time has been spent on changes in admissions Criteria, and grading criteria, and that sort of thing. A lot of time on budget questions. We had a decent input on that. By and large, I think the faculty's role in helping to determine the salary schedule that we'll be living under for the next two years has been a productive one, because I think we were listened to, and that is one area in which we seem to get fair cooperation from the chancellor and the regents. But it's been a notable question, and we've spent a lot of time on it. It's turned out to be deceptive, and we're not going to get what we would like to get. And in any case, although it's not a bad increase at all, in compensation terms, it really is not going to be enough to do battle with the inflationary spiral. So we'll have to work on that again, I'm sure, next year.

There will be some other things coming up. I think an item of continuing interest, now, is the Articulation Board, which most people don't know about, don't know exists, but I think it's a very influential board. It's the board that now works out the relationships between the Community Colleges and the University systems. It's a three-man board, and it's made up exclusively of administrators. In fact, all three are vice presidents, UNR, UNLV, and the community colleges, and the chancellor is also a member of that board. I would like very much to see faculty membership on that board, because there are some, I think, serious problems emerging.

There are no faculty members now?

On the Articulation Board, no. In some degree, it's come to take the place of the old Coordinating Council, which is not surprising. But the need for faculty input there is, I think, determined by the level of faculty anxiety about the community colleges, and how they relate to the University, and that level is high, judging from my experience this year. I think we need some direct input. So that while that's not a problem, we've—well, we have dealt with it in different ways, the whole articulation policy problem, but the Articulation Board, itself, we haven't addressed ourselves yet to the question of faculty membership [but I hope we will].

[The] twenty-to-one [faculty-student ratio] is another thing to think about. I am fairly well convinced the senate is going to spend a lot of time on it next year. The twenty-to-one ratio is crippling, I think, for us. And it is now an across-the-board formula for community college education, all the way to graduate education, and there's just no rhyme nor reason. It's a convenient formula for budgetary purposes. They obviously have a medical school program [that] has got to operate with a different ratio, but somebody else has got to pick up the slack. If the medical school's going to be six to one, then [the] College of Arts and Science is going to be thirty to one. So we've just got to do something about that. It's killing us, choking us, and it makes no sense at all. There is no good argument or rationale or justification for a twenty-to-one, across-the-board ratio. There just isn't. But that's something for next year. We've not dealt with that this year. It's been a legislative year, and it's a little awkward to bring it up whenever there's a budget season.

[The] Adamian case—well, I cannot confess to any surprise on the recent ruling.

I have not read the decision. I was a little surprised as to the grounds, because I thought, as a layman, that there were some violations in due process— that is, procedural. There was a whole battery of suspicious procedural questions that might be the basis for overruling the regents, but that was not it. That was not the basis of Mr. Adamian's attorney's brief, and it was not the basis of the judge's decision. I haven't seen it yet, but I think the effects, again, will be salutary. I think the regents have had a predilection the last several years to involve themselves in personnel questions in an abusive way, and that that chain of abuses is coming to an end. That is, they have learned the hard way. This is now the third court case that I can think of, where the regents have lost, and lost badly. This board, just in the last three years, has had Winterberg, Adamian, and Richardson [cases] all go against them, and I think they've learned, now, that they have to be a little careful in the way that they use the authority that's vested in them.

So I'm very pleased with the court's ruling on that case. It's not a question of whether you like the guy, or like what he did. This was a case that involved the whole faculty, its rights and prerogatives, and most of us recognize that.

Philosophical comment on the trade union movement in the traditionally professional ranks of academe? Well, it's a good [question]. It's a timely and topical one. I am a member of the National Society of Professors, as are three of my four predecessors. One is not. I became a member not because I saw a need for collective bargaining on things like salary and fringe [benefits], which is the traditional area of negotiation for collective bargaining, because I don't think that's been a really overriding problem with us. I think we've generated a good input with the regents, and good relations with the regents. [But] because I was very, very concerned about the continuing intervention

in educational policy, tinkering with the rights of faculty that I saw the regents engaging in, and, in some cases, officers in the system, and I thought that the senate had become ineffective in dealing with these questions, and that the only way, really, that we were going to be able to project ourselves, but not in dollars and cents terms [would be through the NSP].

AAUP has thus far not been geared up to be a collective bargaining agent. It certainly has interest in questions of educational policy, so the question comes down, really, to whether or not one favors collective bargaining. I don't think the AAUP has been an influential force on this campus in affecting the decisions of the regents or of administrators. It doesn't mean that I'm not sympathetic with the AAUP. [NSP seems "stronger"] because it's associated with collective bargaining. The AAUP has never been. Of course, that's part of the whole, hard problem with higher education around the country; I mean, you have to ask yourselves, "Is it professional to belong to a union?" Five years ago, if you'd've asked me that, I'd've said, "No." I wouldn't've thought of joining one. I mean, I just had no interest in that. Now I do, because I've seen the senate rendered, as I've said before, progressively more ineffective. The AAUP certainly would like to have helped [but was] unable to do anything about it. If the only way you can resolve that is through collective bargaining, then I'm in favor of collective bargaining. I believe in bargaining on questions of educational policy, since I believe faculty rights, perquisites, and prerogatives have been altered, violated, and usurped, and—well, that's why I joined.

The legislature has just been hassling with this question, and the end result, I think—although it may be premature to say this—is that there will be no collective bargaining bill this session. But I think, nevertheless, the involvement on the part of the University faculty

in the lobbying process has been helpful, and has convinced their adversaries within the University system that they are prepared to be tough.

Your lobbying has defeated that bill that would've introduced the strike clause.

Yes—and its predecessor, too, which was a terrible bill, which would've created a "company union," a bill that was put together without any consultation at all with the faculty. It was a terrible bill. I testified against it, and it lost, but that doesn't mean it lost because I testified against it. It lost because it was a bad bill, and a lot of people opposed it. What the faculty sought was to be incorporated under the Dodge Act, but that turned out to be impossible. I understand that bill is now being resurrected. But after a great deal of pressure and counter-pressure, of lobbying, [and] attempts at compromise, the bill that finally came out was killed, and it was killed primarily at the request of the schoolteachers and the University professors. But it was a bad bill, still. I think that's—you know, it's a first step, and we people are hopeful that in two years' time, if it still appears that there's a need for an argument engaging it, that we'll have more success.

I didn't do much personal lobbying. I just made a statement before the committee, because I felt it would be not proper for the chairman of the senate to get involved much there. But I think the lobbying that went on was very effective, and certainly, the faculty made some friends of the legislators.

As far as official kinds of lobbying before the money committees, there was some. I was at the money committee hearings, although I didn't say anything to speak of, and I certainly could not be classified as an effective presence there, just as a presence. So outside of the collective bargaining bill, there wasn't any faculty lobbying that I'm aware of. I may be

wrong about that. And student lobbying, I'm just not sure what the students may have done.

Impact of this legislature on UNR—well, it's reasonably clear now, the budget we're going to get is the budget that the governor asked for. It's not a bad budget in light of the harsh realities of twenty to one, and growth of community colleges, and declining enrollments, and end of the war. I certainly don't want to describe the end of the war as a harsh reality, but it's an economic reality. I don't think we did too badly, although I think we've got some terrible financial problems to face the next two years, and so, in that sense, the impact of the legislature is not a good one. But under the extant circumstances, I think we probably did as well as we could, budget-wise. I think there's great room for improvement, however.

The role of committees at UNR—that's hard for me to say. Some of 'em are very effective, others hardly ever meet. They're all too large. One should add that some meet just for the sake of meeting, and never get anything done. The senate committees [we have only four standing, and a couple of ad hocs] by and large, they've been effective committees. They've done their work. There aren't any overlapping functions there, but I'm sure there are in the broader context of University committees, boards, and commissions, a lot of duplication of effort, and a lot of room for improvement. Someday, somebody ought to take it upon himself, or herself, or themselves to campaign for that, but that person was not going to be me this year. I have enough to do.

The academic year just past, in relation to the last several—well, I think it's been a much quieter year all the way around, much easier to bear for me. I think, as I said before, my two immediate predecessors as senate chairmen were, I think, radicalized by the experience, and left office terribly, terribly disillusioned, and frustrated, and angry, and hostile. I don't

leave office that way at all. For one thing, I was realistic, perhaps more so than they could have been, about the potential, the possibilities. But more than that, it's just been a very quiet year. Apart from the code, there haven't been any really major frustrations.

Personal satisfactions with the involvement of faculty in University governance—that's a very hard thing for me to judge. It's probably an unfair question. [RGH: Well, you've spoken to it, somewhat, already.] I don't know what the net effect will be. I think the relations have been recently good. The senate has gotten along well together, and has gotten along well with the president, and with the vice presidents, although we've had, certainly, our differences of opinion. Whether that means that we are more involved in University governance or not, I couldn't measure that. I really don't know. That's a very complex question.

As far as the future role of the faculty in University governance is concerned, I think I have said before there is a whole lot of room for improvement, and I think we've got to go back to some of the things that I've been talking about, like these personnel questions, where the regents have learned some painful lessons about their [from my point of view] Unnecessary intervention. That may redound to faculty's benefit in the future. So may the effectiveness of the University faculty lobbyists before the legislature, with regard to the collective bargaining bill this year. I think we really did ourselves some good there. That is, we perhaps improved our position vis-à-vis the administrators, and the chancellor, and the regents. That's only a speculation, but I think it's a possibility, that the faculty may be returning to a position something like the one they occupied previously, but it can never be quite like that because the "gravy train" has been derailed, and all their nice money is gone. So it's harder to get along with each

other now, I guess, than it was before, but at least able to function somewhat less in the adversary relationship that has characterized the last three years.

On the other hand, the possibility of collective bargaining, if it becomes a reality, it means precisely that: some kind of adversary relationship, but within defined bounds, and understood by both sides to be adversary, so that you agree in advance that you are adversaries. Now, we've not, of course, done that, as far as the senate, and the regents, and other adversaries that the senate has seemed to have these last several years, are concerned. But the reality has been an [laughing] adversary reality, and there's no future in continuing that kind of relationship, it seems to me, with the senate and its adversaries. I mean, we can go on doing it, but the faculty role is relatively ineffective, and it doesn't seem to me to go anywhere. So I think it's either that the faculty, through the senate, increases its influence and its authority in the traditional ways, or that collective bargaining is going to take over. And one way or the other, the faculty would seem to be in a position to improve. Now, that may be too rosy a picture, and it's certainly conceivable that neither will transpire, and that the faculty rights will be further invaded and frustrated, and that the regents will become more and more hostile to the faculty. I mean, that's a possibility. But based on my experience, I don't think that's likely. We're so much at the mercy of outside forces, you know. If there hadn't been a war in Vietnam, and there hadn't been campus turmoil, the whole picture would obviously have been different at this point. And if that sort of thing happens again, why, we can be affected again, I'm sure.

[Editor's note: Because of important events occurring after the initial interview, a second taping session was held on May 21, 1973.]

In the initial interview I did for this project in April, I indicated that the year had been a relatively quiet one, and I would stand with that, but I would like to qualify that commentary a bit. I also indicated that, by and large, this year, communications between the faculty and the administration had been good, and I had not much to offer by way of complaint on that score. I said that the principal crunch, at least for me, as senate chairman, had come really back in June and July over the code, and that from then on, everything was relatively pacific.

I have cause now, as I said, to want to change my comment a bit as a result of the work program that the administration decided upon in the last couple of weeks, and in regard to which there has been considerable debate among the faculty, and about which a number of faculty, including myself, testified at the meeting of the Board of Regents, the most recent meeting, a week ago.*

The work program, as nearly as everyone on campus now understands it, restricts the capability of the University to function as a university. In part, this is due to the twenty-to-one ratio [that's something I also talked about earlier]. I think, if the work program had evolved as I assumed it was evolving, even with the twenty-to-one ratio, we could've lived with it. I'm sure we'll live with it, anyway, but we could've lived with it far more comfortably. The twenty to one is an issue which I had said earlier we would have to address—the faculty would have to address—because it was confining. We were unable to address the question of quality in connection with that ratio, but I viewed that as a long-range project that is an analysis of that ratio in terms of what effect it has on the

*A copy of this testimony may be found in the University Archives

programs that the University of Nevada, Reno, has to offer—graduate programs, professional programs, undergraduate, lower division and upper division programs—all of them chunked in under twenty to one, along with community colleges and UNLV. Well, that's a problem, and I thought, "We're going to have to address that problem," and a lot of other people were thinking the same way; and that was a plan, kind of, for next year.

And then along came this work program. What I was unaware of, as senate chairman, and what other faculty were unaware of, and unprepared for, was the establishment of priorities for this University under twenty to one, which is to say that we experience, quite suddenly, to my way of thinking, a radical alteration of the extant priorities. It's difficult to properly, point by point, summate the problem areas and the priority picture. But, to oversimplify, the problem lies in the award to the medical school of an increase in its state appropriated budget of 9.7 positions, and something like \$45,000 in operating monies, and an additional \$50,- or \$60,000—it's not clear exactly how much— that will go to the medical school as a result of an increase in the surcharge for each medical student, making for a grand total in the vicinity of \$330,000, which, in one way or another, is made up of state funds, as compared with this year's budget, which is on the order of \$35,- or \$40,000.

"Well," one might argue, "the medical school requires that," and, indeed, the medical school is making that argument. It requires it for purposes of accreditation. The problem comes when you look at the total work program and see that virtually every other area of the University is adversely affected, sometimes in crippling ways, sometimes to the extent that accreditation for a particular professional school is endangered in order to

accommodate the medical school's needs. For this, we were unprepared.

There was a budget that went to the governor in the fall, which broke down, for the various colleges and units, the positions, the FTE positions, and the operating funds that would be allotted. Now, that budget did indicate an increase in support for the medical school, a dramatic increase in support for the medical school, and some rather dramatic decreases for other colleges. Well, when I saw that, I was concerned, and others were, too, because I got a number of phone calls, and so I made it a point to talk to the president of the University, and to Mr. Jessup from the chancellor's office, about that budget. I was told by both of them that those figures were meaningless, that they had to be in there because the budget office required it, but they had absolutely no relationship to the final work program, and that neither I nor other faculty should be in the least bit concerned about those figures.

With all respect to the chancellor, and to the chancellor's office, and certainly, to the president, I was nevertheless still a little skeptical, and so I asked the same question at various junctures, in a period of about three weeks about four times, and I was given the same answer on each occasion in discussions with the president and with the vice president. It was announced to the Academic Council that those figures were meaningless and ought not to be broadcast for fear they would frighten people; and I announced it to the senate, that the figures were meaningless.

It turns out, however, when we get the work program, that the figures are *not* meaningless, that they are approximately [laughing] where they were as of last November. I do not accuse anyone of deviousness. I don't think that's what happened. I am not sure what *did* happen. All I know is that until I walked into the chancellor's cabinet meeting two weeks ago, ten days in

advance of the regents' meeting to which the work program was to be presented, I had not the foggiest notion that the medical school was going to get all this money at the expense of nearly every other unit in the University. I found out that afternoon. I got a copy of the work program. We went over it in about forty-five minutes' time in the chancellor's cabinet, not enough time, really, to come to grips with it. I took it home, I examined it closely, and I was appalled. And I learned shortly [laughing] that a lot of other people were equally appalled.

The short of it is that the period of quiet that I talked about earlier came very rapidly to an end. There was—I guess I could safely use the term—an enormous output of bitterness from the faculty from all across the University regarding this work program. A special meeting of the senate, which had been called earlier to deal with the proposed bylaws, was turned over totally to discussion of the work program, a four-hour meeting. That meeting passed two resolutions—this was held three days in advance of the regents' meeting—and I was asked to convey those resolutions to the Board of Regents, together with accompanying arguments in support of them, which I did.

The regents listened to us courteously. They gave us a lot of time, five or six hours. I think, personally, they were a little dumbfounded by the level and the intensity of the criticism of this work program. I'm not convinced that they're going to change the work program. That seems unlikely. I think we may have done ourselves some good in the long range. One by-product already, that is observable, is the willingness of the administration to take a second look at twenty to one. There's a lot of people interested in doing that. So I think perhaps the long range effect will be salutary. Certainly, we cannot continue to survive on budgets such as the one that is proposed by this work program.

The impression that I wanted to correct, as I said earlier, was that this had been a year that was singularly quiet. [This] is not quite the case. It started out as a year of confrontation with the code. The rest of the time was peaceful, by and large, until the work program came up, and that was certainly the worst crunch, the number one confrontation, of the year, and indeed, I expect, probably, the most intensive and difficult confrontation since the Adamian affair of three years ago. It was personally difficult to me because it involved—well, we were taking exception to the work program that was supported by the president. My feeling is that the decision to alter the priorities so quickly and so radically was the chancellor's decision. I cannot document that, but I have that strong feeling. The president, in any case, supported it, so we were taking on both the president and the chancellor. The regents, as I said, were courteous, for the most part. How favorably disposed they were towards our point of view, I don't know. But I did not mind taking on the regents, nor even the chancellor, nearly as much as I was disappointed, at least, to have to argue publicly with the president, because he's been very fair with me, as has Vice President Anderson. Our communications, for the most part, have been very good, but I think they really broke down on the work program question.

I wanted to correct any impression I may have left as a result of my earlier comments, that the budget was one we could not just live with, but that, really, it wouldn't be too bad. I no longer think that. I think it's a devastating work program. And I think that it is indicative of a problem in the area of communications, and in the area of faculty input, that has got to be dealt with, and I'm hopeful that in the course of the next year, we can at least begin to deal with.

FACULTY WOMEN'S CAUCUS

RUTH H. DONOVAN, PRESIDENT

Ruth H. Donovan: I am Ruth Donovan, the chairman of the Faculty Women's Caucus. The Faculty Women's Caucus grew out of the hearings that were held a year ago on the status of women on the University campus. It seemed to the women who were involved with that series of hearings that there was a real need for an organization for, primarily, the professional women on campus, but as it developed, we are happy to have any interested women on the campus join us. The people who actually were instrumental in forming it were Roberta Barnes, Anne Howard, Mimi Goldman, and Barbara Peevers. I think Anne has actually been as cohesive an element in the organization as anyone. Her interest has been very steady, and very, very helpful. She's, of course, serving as the secretary.

We started last spring. These four women just sent out a notice to all the female names they could dredge up from various sources [laughing], and this proved an interesting exercise, too, just trying to find out who all the people were that might be concerned. Their feeling was that it would be very

helpful just for these people to get to know one another, to see what common problems they might have, and to perhaps organize a little activity towards trying to solve some of these problems. So, a year ago, about [April], I guess, or a little later on—I can't remember the [exact] dating—we started meeting at noontimes, since this seemed to be a better time for a lot of people to be free. Everyone was encouraged just to bring their lunch along, and come and talk out whatever was on their minds.

We felt, after the first couple of meetings, that it would be worthwhile to have some kind of officers, just to, if nothing else, keep track of when to have meetings, and notify people about meetings. And also, at that time, we felt that if we were going to use University facilities for a meeting, that we had to be recognized as a campus group. We were meeting primarily in the Student Union, and there are restrictions on using Union facilities unless you are an organized, recognized group. So we contacted the president's office to ask what we needed to do to be recognized,

and got the information [that] we would have to have a constitution, and just a few very rudimentary things. At that point, we decided that we would go ahead and comply with these regulations. He, in the meantime, gave us temporary recognition, which he evidently has the power to do. It was a very nice little memo.

We proceeded to appoint a committee to write us a constitution, and we collected whatever anybody wanted to throw in a kitty to cover sending out notices of meetings. And at that time, we just had a temporary chairman and a temporary secretary. Anne Howard was selected secretary, and she has kept track of our very small bank account, so she's actually serving as treasurer, too, I guess you would say.

So, over the summer, we kept on meeting in this informal way. There were sometimes five or six people there; sometimes we had a fair-sized crowd of people. And that's been one rather interesting thing about the organization, the way people come and go, and the different flavor of the group at different meetings. It has kept quite a steady interest from a great variety of women from various parts of the campus, and I think this purpose of getting acquainted has been very helpful to all of us, and has been quite worthwhile.

As fall came along, we decided, for our first meeting of the fall, to try to schedule some kind of a program to perhaps interest new people to the campus. So we invited representatives from a variety of women's groups in the community to come and just say a few words about their organizations with a view of letting people new to the campus know what other kinds of organizations were available in the community. And we got quite a good turnout at that meeting. I don't know as we'd want to do anything- exactly that way

again. Several women's groups were invited. We had someone from the League of Women Voters, from the Women's Democratic Club, Women's Republican Club, from the Business and Professional Women's Organization, from the Women's Political Caucus.

By the way, I think the name of the organization is kind of interesting, too. It sounds terribly political, and that was intentional, to keep it from getting confused with the Women's Faculty Club, which is, obviously, a social organization designed for the wives of faculty members. We wanted to make it pretty clear to people that this was a different sort of organization, but it's actually not as militant as it might sound [laughing], from the name of it. That's the connotation one has these days, perhaps not quite fairly. But it was rather intentional, to [name] it that way.

The first kind of active project we got involved with— there was a strong feeling expressed in the hearings on the status of women on the campus, that women were not represented on the University's governing committees and boards as much as they should be. So we started out in the spring, and contacted the new chairman of the Faculty Senate, Joe Crowley, and told him that we hoped that they would consider putting Women on as many committees and boards as seemed appropriate, or there were people interested in serving.

There was some question, by the way, expressed at one of our meetings [I'm not sure which person it was, and it really doesn't matter] that sometimes, the preference sheets that individual faculty members fill out do not get completely through the channels to the president's office, that somewhere along the line, perhaps the department chairman sits on them, perhaps the dean sits on them, sometimes people don't even see a form to

fill out. Whether this is actually true, I don't have any way of knowing, but Joe Crowley did say that they got all the forms. The [Faculty] Senate ends up with all the forms, and he would be very happy for anybody to go and look through and see if her form was there or not. So we did announce this. Whether anybody did it—you know, followed through on it—I don't know. But I thought this was quite interesting, too. And that, of course, might've been what had happened in the past, in keeping women from serving. But the Faculty Senate, the executive board, which does the selecting and recommending of committees, certainly did a very good job, as far as getting women on committees, and, from what I could tell, also getting a lot of newer people appointed to committees.

This has been a feeling, too, I think, that in the past, so often, it had been the same people who had served over and over again, who kept being asked to serve. Many of these people—and this turned up in our contacts—people who had been called upon so often asked, "For heaven sakes, help me get *off* some of these." So there *was* a feeling of having been overburdened. So I think this was a very worthwhile activity, and I hope that it will continue to be true, that there is a little fairer representation.

Of course, I think one problem we've run into is these committees are getting too big, and just how that can be solved, I don't know. This is one general problem with democracy. When you [laughing] try to give everyone representation, you run into this overstaffing of committees.

Another interesting aspect of this, there've been several women serving as chairmen of committees and boards, which has not been exactly traditional. There've been a few obvious boards or committees that women have been chairing. But I think, for the first

time, there was a female chairman of the Library Committee, and the Educational Television Board, and the Space Planning Board. So this has been an interesting development.

That was one very satisfying project, in that you can see some actual results. So often, in these things, they drag on and on and on, and, you know, it's just promises and very little else. But this was about the first thing that we did, and I think we all felt pretty good about it, because it did turn out well.

Another thing we did when we were doing this, by the way, was, since we have had this inquiry about the preference forms getting to the proper source, we did send out our own little form, and suggest that people, if they were concerned, send their preferences to us, too, and these we gave directly to Joe Crowley. This, I think, might have helped if there was any kind of problem.

Then, we got involved, next, or concurrently with this project, with the problem of the women's athletics and recreation program. That is still not resolved, and I don't know how well or in what way it's going to be. We, through cooperation with the women's athletic department, wrote a letter to President Miller protesting the inequality between the program for men and for women, with some supporting material. He referred the matter to Harry Wolf, who is, of course, the University's Affirmative Action officer. He did some investigation, and replied to the president that, essentially, we were right. There were great inequities. He did have a couple of errors—or, misunderstandings in what he recommended. And this is something that most of us just don't understand, when you get talking about the size of a softball field, you know, the dimensions, and how many square feet or feet square. This is where we got all snarled. So, at any rate, we sent

another letter, a follow-up letter, pointing out these [errors] and reiterating our hope that something would be done.

The president, later on, in fact, in the winter, appointed a committee—another committee, you know— [laughing] the usual way of handling some of these things—to make recommendations to him of what should be done to make the athletic and recreation programs for men and women [more equitable]. That's the way he put it, as I recall, in order to fulfill this statement in the Affirmative Action policy that was adopted for the campus. He waited 'til after that statement was adopted as University policy, and then appointed this committee, which consists of two students, Rick Elmore, who was president of ASUN; Rayona Sharpnack, who is a very active student in the women's athletic and physical education programs; Luella Lilly; Richard Trachok; Bob Laughter; and myself, as a consultant. And I'm sure that the reason I was made a consultant to this committee was because of the Faculty Women's Caucus interest and involvement in pressuring for some kind of change.

This committee is still meeting. We haven't gotten our final report to the president. But this should be submitted later on this spring, before the end of the semester, at any rate. [We were] just to make the recommendations. Now, actually, as far as I can tell, there are recommendations just pouring out of the trees that've been turned in to so many different places. But this committee is the president's committee. You know, so many of these are receiving reports for their own purposes. The athletic investigation, done by a senate committee, produced a very extensive report. But, of course, that went to the senate. They are, I understand, going to recommend it to the president. But this was a senate project, of course. Some of this same

information is contained in that report, and just what is going to come of that, of course, at this point, no one knows.

The Women's Athletic Board has received all kinds of recommendations, and passed budgets, and all sorts of supportive statements. But again, where does the money come from? In this time of very stringent budgets—at least, from the outlook right now—there's not going to be much to play around with. I do not know—and this is something I should've kept better track of—what the Commission on the Status of Women has done in this area, because, of course, this was one of their [priorities]. But at any rate, this is a continuing project. It seems to be something that we have been working with since we organized, and we're still very much interested in—and working towards.

During the year, several people did bring up individual problems they had. I guess it might've gone to the commission, too, but the commission took such a long time to get organized, because of the difficulty in finding a chairman, evidently. Perhaps for this reason, we got several of these individuals. And perhaps they felt freer in our rather informal sessions to bring up problems they had. And at least two of these people, I know, did consult Harry Wolf about their problem. What has come of that, I don't know. I don't know whether I ever will. Actually, in one case, I did go with the gal to talk to him, just largely as moral support, you know, just to have somebody along to kind of break the ice a little bit, because this is not anything that anyone likes to have to do.

One case was a problem of feeling discrimination in promotion. It happens to be a person very close to retirement, and it is going to affect her total amount of retirement pay very markedly. I don't know whether anything could be done about it. It seemed

to me, in reading the faculty code, that there were some loopholes that could be used in her favor, but whether the powers that be would read it the way I did, I don't know.

The other was a case of a woman who is a part-time faculty member, who felt she had been passed over in getting a full-time appointment in her department, though she was better qualified, having a Ph.D., as opposed to the person who got the appointment having a master's degree, which, at least on the surface, does seem to be most unfair. So, again, I don't know what might be taking place, but I know, in both cases, Mr. Wolf was most interested in trying to do something. He takes a very positive approach to these things, which is good. I certainly don't envy him his job [laughing]. It must be a very, very difficult—.

Ruth G. Hilts: The caucus acts as sort of a catalyst between problems and solutions?

Well, yes. I would say we are, very definitely, a catalyst, a pressure group, if you [laughing] want to put it in another way. I think that's, really, a role that this kind of organization can play. Now, the Commission on the Status of Women is an appointive group that is supposed to be reporting to the president, and would not feel quite as free, I'm sure, to take up this kind of cause, and just use what you would call a "little pressure" to try to get something done about it. I think it must do somewhat the same thing, but I think this group has had an *opportunity*, really, to do this kind of thing, and we've tried to react as successfully as we could to situations. I think it's something you never really know how best to handle, because every one that comes up is a little different, and we probably have not been as effective as we might've been if we had tried something a little different.

I think the president has been very sympathetic. I suppose, at times, he might've just wished that these women would shut up and go away, but [laughing] he has been receptive, certainly, and has expressed interest in coming to one of our meetings. We haven't been able to get together with him on a time, but I think it would be very interesting if he could, and if some of our members, particularly those who have things they'd like to ask him about specifically, have a chance to just sit down with him and talk to him about their problems, or women's problems in general, or just plain campus problems.

I think we have all felt that our usefulness need not just be limited to women's problems, that there are other difficulties the campus has, that just a little interest shown can be useful. We've talked from time to time about the problem of advisement, and students feeling that no one is really interested in them, as individuals, and their problems. And this, I think, is certainly an area that any interested group of faculty members can get interested [in] and give some useful thought and time to.

We've been interested in the problems of older women students returning to school. The Student Affairs office put on an interesting day-long program for women like this in the community, urging them to come. It happened to be the day of one of the major snowstorms, so they didn't [laughing] have [a large] turnout, but they had very interested people. I did get over there for a little while, just to offer a little support, and—you know—just kinda get a feel for what was going on. People came up, you know, asked questions, and really showed some interest and enthusiasm. One thing that was asked about [was] financial aids. This is certainly a problem for women, often women with families, who have child care

problems, and the whole gambit of economic problems in trying to go back to school. So we were discussing various ways of letting people know what kinds of financial aids were available. Cecelia St. John, who has been coordinating that kind of thing, came to the meeting just after this program had gone on, and I think we gave her quite a few really useful suggestions about what might be done another time. Of course, they weren't going to plan another session like that, probably, 'til next year sometime. But at least, it seemed to me that she picked up quite a few good ideas just from the discussion that day.

This question of child care is another thing that the group has been interested in, child care both for students' children, and for staff and faculty children. There has been a subcommittee working on this, and, again, trying to serve as more or less a catalyst to get the people together who are concerned in this, or who might be able to help in it. At the present moment, several people in a class in Social Services and Corrections are writing a grant proposal to try to get some money to start a more adequate child care facility for the campus. I think this is exceedingly worthwhile, both [as a] good experience for them, as a class project, and perhaps very helpful to the campus in getting something together that can be used to try to go further, you know, go to the next step. There were several people who were really very actively interested in this. One has children, and she can't find a place in the community where she wants to leave them, and then other, just plain interested people, you know, who have followed this kind of thing, just would like to see something done. Any committees we've had have been volunteer people who expressed an interest, and wanted to work on some kind of a project. Again, we don't pretend to take the responsibility for going

ahead and doing the thing; [we are] trying to get to the people concerned, to see if we can't get them to get together and really carry through on it. So this project is still going on, and towards the end of the semester, we should get a copy of the proposal that the girls are putting together, and see, from there, where that could go, perhaps, [for] some source of [financing]. Harry Wolf has said that he's aware of various funding sources for this kind of thing, so he will be useful in advising on perhaps where such a thing could be submitted to try and get some money.

One other thing that we really, as individuals, got interested in—or, we're *still* interested in, I guess I should say—was the Equal Rights Amendment and its course through our state legislature, which was not too happy for most of us. A number of our members had actively been working for this for quite a long time—in fact, had been interested at the time of the elections, and in sounding out the candidates on their stand on the Equal Rights Amendment. So we had quite a bit of, really, very active interest in this. We did, along in the session, send around petitions to get as many names as we could to send down to the committee that was holding the hearings on the amendment. At the time of the hearings, several of our members did go down, both to testify and to just be there to show interest. There was a strong feeling among women who were active in supporting the amendment and wanting to help influence it, that just being there would be very helpful, just to show the legislators that there was a great deal of interest. Well, I'm sure they were well aware there was a great deal of interest [laughing]. We also had an active campaign of getting individuals to write to legislators. We bought postcards and handed them out, just encouraging people to send an individual

communication to their legislators. I think many of us did do this, and got varying replies.

Well, it was quite a disappointing situation, and I think it will be an active issue again for our group, certainly. At least from all appearances, it's not going to make it through enough states this year to become ratified, so it'll be probably coming up again in two years, and this is something, again, to start working on at election time. I think we will probably still be having this kind of active interest—at least, I would suspect, from knowing the kinds of people who are interested in our organization, that this would be the case.

What we will be pursuing next year, it's hard to say. Of course, the Affirmative Action policy is nowhere being met. There are many areas—. One thing that I've had mentioned to me several times recently is the need to have some more recognition of part-time people, because, of course, most of the part-time people on the campus are women. The people who are not full-time employees have no vote in elections for the Faculty Senate, and are not eligible for tenure. [There's] a number of areas where there's just no recognition of the fact that part-time people exist on this campus. So this, I presume, will be something that we'll be considering in the future, if nothing is done about it in the interim.

I would hope that the athletic situation would be improving, but I suspect that this is something that we'll be watching for quite some time to come, since there is such a financial problem involved. It looks like it'll be a long-term project, but we certainly don't want to forget about it. So this, again, will be probably one of the things we'll be working on in the future.

I suppose we'll continue meeting over the summer, as we did last year. There are enough people who are around all year around that I think it's worthwhile just to kind of keep the

group together, and to just keep on things like the committee appointments, because this is done during the summer. And there are other things that perhaps need watching, and can be of interest, just to bat around a little bit at a group session.

NATIONAL SOCIETY OF PROFESSORS
HUGH N. MOZINGO, PRESIDENT
JAMES T. RICHARDSON, VICE-PRESIDENT

PROFESSOR HUGH MOZINGO, PRESIDENT

Hugh Mozingo: I'll direct most of my comments to the National Society for Professors, its activities, goals, and achievements or lack of achievements, during this past year.

I became president beginning the first of September, and succeeded Charles [P.] Bartl in that position. Members of our executive board are Elmer Rusco, Lowell Shifley, Glen Atkinson, Neal Ferguson, Howard Cords, Jim Richardson (who is vice president and president-elect), Gary Peltier, and Charles Bartl, the past president.

At the beginning of the year, Clifton Blincoe was our secretary, but had to resign because of teaching load, and Gary Peltier was elected in his place.

Our activities have revolved pretty largely about the problems of recruiting on campus, and educating the faculty to some of the major philosophical goals of NSP. I like to think of the organization not so much as a trade union, because that tends to imply to

many people that we are interested only in improved salary and improved fringe benefit aspects. I think if we had to depend upon interest in those two areas, our membership would be very low. There is not a great deal of dissatisfaction about salary, but there is a lot of dissatisfaction about working conditions, student-faculty ratios, operating budgets for individual departments, and what appear to be inequities, in some cases. In general, much of the discontent has to do with the details of administration and operation of the University, and not with salary and fringe benefits *per se*; at least, this is the way that I read the comments that I've received from numerous faculty members.

NSP, of course, also has as some of its goals very much the same kinds of things that the AAUP has; that is, increasing the degree of academic freedom, or more precisely defining it, perhaps, is a better way of putting it, the nature of academic freedom peculiar to a university.

Improving the professional status of university professors—and by that, I mean

primarily the attempt to achieve a greater degree of self-determination on the part of professionals in the teaching profession—. Many of us feel now, that among all groups of professionals, that teachers have less self-determination—or are permitted less self-determination—than is true of almost any other group. Engineers, lawyers, and doctors all have more capability for self-determination, or they're permitted more. To a certain extent, of course, this limitation on self-determination is structured by the need to work in a university rather than independently and by the need to depend on public funds for support. But to many of us, at least, it does seem that the amount of self-determination that we are presently permitted is far below the minimum.

I suppose, also, what we're attempting to achieve, putting it another way, is a greater degree of participatory management. That is, many of us view enlightened management as consisting of not so much autocratic, dictatorial qualities, as the qualities that involve sensitivity to the will of the faculty, of the will of any professional group, and the ability to lead and persuade, rather than to dictate. Well, that, perhaps, is enough on the basic philosophy.

Our achievements during the past year have been, I think, fairly remarkable, in view of the fact that we really have, aside from this philosophical position, not very much to offer the faculty. Our membership presently runs around eighty members, and we achieve this level with a relatively low-key campaign.

I suppose under the heading of disappointments this year, our major disappointment is the apparent failure—although there are apparently two days left to the legislature—of an attempt to get through some modification of the Dodge Act that would also allow negotiations on the

part of the University faculty. I won't bother here to go into the details of that, since Jim Richardson will probably cover that point.

We did marshal, I think, more political force than any of us thought we had way back in September, and it's just unfortunate that we could not achieve a suitable compromise. I think the big problem, now, for NSP, is to show our members and potential members that we do have something to offer other than simply negotiations and collective bargaining, that there are some other advantages to belonging to NSP. Many members, I think, wrongly look on this as the only attribute and the only reason for belonging to NSP, and we've got to, somehow, demonstrate that there are other reasons for belonging, that if it's valid to belong to AAUP, it's also valid to belong to NSP.

The Adamian affair we have not been involved with at all, and I don't think I'm familiar enough with the legal details, right now, to comment on it one way or the other. We were certainly never officially asked to involve ourselves in this affair. And since it was controversial, and since we are a new organization, it was the decision of the executive board that we should not concern ourselves with it.

I think, with regard to philosophical comments on the "trade union" [laughing], I've already made something of a statement along those lines. And I think the union activity in America has been generally worthwhile. Naturally, of course, there are corrupt unions, primarily because corrupt people have gotten into positions of leadership. But I don't think there's any question that it's improved the status of the working man, it's improved his financial picture, and I'm not convinced by the arguments that this would have improved, anyway, had there been no union. Certainly, I think the majority of the working class would disagree with that kind of statement.

I think that our situation is somewhat different than a trade union. We're not concerned with what we regard as onerously low salary schedules, or slave labor conditions, although some might say it amounts to that, when we have a ten-credit-hour teaching load. We are concerned, I think, and rightly so, primarily with educational policy, and with many policy decisions being made by people, which, rightly or wrongly, some regard as not spending enough, or any, time in the classroom to allow them to have the background to make this kind of decision. What we're looking for, I suppose, is simply more feedback, feedback in a meaningful fashion, and a sense of participatory management. I think if this were achieved, the impetus towards a professional "trade union" type of organization would largely disappear. There are many universities in which this kind of an impetus is largely nonexistent, and I think that may be the crux of the whole problem here. If management's view—and I don't like to think of the University as being managed in the industrial sense—but if management's view of the faculty can be changed, and if there can be a meaningful feedback, and meaningful determination of educational policy by the faculty, then I think there would not be a need, or any impetus at all, for an organization like NSP, or, for that matter, even AAUP.

Ruth G. Hilts: I always thought of faculty people as being independent professionals, such as lawyers and doctors. Are you not allowed that kind of freedom as a professor, so that you have to have a spokesman?

I don't think we are, to the extent that we feel we have very little input into some of the teaching policy considerations that go on. Well, I'm tempted not to use individual examples, but I know of departments that are,

and have been for years, grossly underfunded. Independent, objective observers from outside the University have reached the same conclusion. And these conclusions are known to University administrators, and yet year after year, the conditions are not changed. I think there needs to be more input from the general faculty member into administrative levels. I would like to see a policy espoused by Linn Carter, who published an article last year in *Science*, put into practice (that is, the evaluation not only of department chairmen, but all levels of administration.) It should be possible to accomplish an objective evaluation (entailing, of course, some self-criticism at each level) of every administrative level. Certainly, I think the faculty have no objection to being evaluated by students, provided, of course, they can play some part in the structuring of this evaluation. It must, I think, be a self-evaluation, to a great extent. But I see no logical reason why this concept should not be extended to every administrative level. I think the inevitable result of doing that would be the improvement not only of teaching, but also administration.

Other achievements, I think, could be considered to be increasing the awareness of many faculty members about conditions outside the University, and how this University compares with other similar universities over the nation, the development of some realization among the faculty that we can develop some political influence, and that with persistence, this political influence may make itself felt in terms of achieving a better educational system at the University.

**PROFESSOR JAMES T. RICHARDSON,
VICE PRESIDENT**

James T. Richardson: I am James T. Richardson. I'm chairman of the department

of sociology, I'm serving this year on the Faculty Senate, the Graduate Council, the Undergraduate Council, and I'm the vice president and president elect of the National Society of Professors group, which is an affiliate of the Nevada State Education Association and NEA, the National Educational Association.

The National Society of Professors group is fairly new on campus, having been in existence about a year and a half. We have had upwards of eighty members within that time period, and expect to continue to grow over the next few years. We organized our group about a year and a half ago in response to several events that were taking place on campus, where we felt faculty opinions were being slighted or completely overlooked in the area of University governance. A number of faculty felt that the opinions of faculty were not being sought or heeded by the administration and by political leaders in the state when very important decisions were being made about education. This particular impetus to organize into a group is not understood by a number of people, including our own administration, who apparently feel that the reason we organized is that we simply want more money. And that is as far from the truth as one could get, as I testified during the last month in front of the state legislature. The salary situation at the University of Nevada is, of course, not the world's best, but it's also not the world's worst, and that's simply not the thing that gave impetus to our forming a group.

Things that gave impetus to the group forming involved higher level policy decisions being made by the administration and by political leaders in the state. For instance, particularly on this campus, our major thrust revolves around the notion of financing of higher education, the fact that recently we have been saddled with a twenty-to-one student-faculty ratio. And the problems that

have been caused by that on this campus had as much to do as anything with the organizing of the National Society of Professors, and with the general frustration felt on campus by a large number of people. We go to department chairmen's meetings, or senate meetings, and every time we go, we hear another sad story about how terrible the financial picture is for the University. We are aware of the fact that the University probably smaller next year than it is this year, and that it's smaller this year than it was last year in terms of number of faculty, and that's very distressing for a number of people.

[We can talk about that whole funding picture later, if you want to develop that. I have quite a bit of information on funding. I did a study for the Graduate Council, a kind of a national comparison of the state of Nevada with the rest of the nation concerning funding for higher education and support for graduate programs. Right now, it would be a digression, because we're talking about the regents-NSP part.]

The other reason that NSP was given a real boost involved the way the University code was developed last year. You may recall that the University faculty worked for at least eighteen months, if not two years, developing a code, several versions of which were submitted to the faculty for vote. And then last year, apparently around spring break time, the administration got together, and the presidents of the divisions plus the chancellor wrote a system code that was then accepted by the Board of Regents without ever being submitted to a faculty vote. This incensed a number of people because of the procedure involved. There was an understanding that the code would be presented to the faculty for a vote and for their comment, and that was not done. And then there's some substandard things in the code that are

extremely disturbing. For instance, the code deletes any kind of coordinating faculty body between the three divisions of the University—four divisions, counting DRI. There used to be something called a Coordinating Council that met once a month prior to the regents' meetings. The faculty senates had three representatives apiece on this group, and it was extremely helpful in getting the senates together on policy matters. That was simply done away with. It was left out of the system code deliberately, a number of people think, in an attempt to break down communication between faculty groups on the two campuses. So, one thing you can say about the National Society of Professors is it is a group that is set up to develop this communication. We have three chapters now, one at UNLV, one here, and one at Elko Community College [now Northeastern Nevada Community College]. We're hoping to start chapters very soon on the other community college campuses here, in this area, and in Clark County.

Other matters that gave some impetus to the National Society of Professors starting involved the way the regents and the administration have handled some personnel matters in the last several years. I just received a call today from a newspaper reporter that wants to talk about this problem. Most people don't realize that the Board of Regents have been sued five times, and within the last two to three years they've lost four of those suits. The one that they did win was a kind of a cut-and-dried thing. A fellow at UNLV had received a promise of tenure on being hired. He was in the English Department, I think. He received a promise of tenure from the president of the University when he came there, and it was an obvious fact that the president of the University can't promise anybody tenure, so the case was thrown out of court. But they've lost the Winterberg case at

UNLV: they had to settle the Mordy case out of court— capitulated on at least one year's salary. They had to settle my case out of court, and now they've lost the Adamian matter. All of these indicate a certain disregard for tradition and for the legality of how they do personnel matters. If they're losing court cases, they're also involved in problems of law. So all of these things working together have helped contribute to the development of the national Society of Professors.

Now, talking about its aims and goals a little bit, the basic aim of the National Society of Professors is to have more meaningful input into the making of educational policy in this state for higher education. The main aim is *not* simply economic, in terms of salaries and fringe benefits. It's much broader than that, and this came, apparently, as something of a surprise to our administration people who were testifying in the legislature during the last session. [We could talk a little bit more about that in a moment.] For instance, we would like to really have- some input to change the overall student-faculty ratio that is forced on everybody by decisions made by administrators and politicians. It's a demonstrable fact that we are the smallest state-supported institution in the country granting doctorate degrees that has the student-faculty ratio that we have. That's one of the findings of my study. I was able to prove that this is the case, and that there's no other doctoral granting institution in the country as small as this, [a] public institution, that has as few funds to do the job with. We have, I think, fifteen Ph.D. programs, forty-eight Masters programs, and several professional schools here, and it's just really an unbelievable picture, when you start comparing yourself around the country. That's the kind of policy decision that some of us are interested in getting involved in.

For that reason, we may or may not, depending on the circumstances, push in the next session of the legislature for the right to collective bargaining. If collective bargaining involves those broader issues, then, we're willing to do it. If not, then we prefer not to do it, as we testified in the legislature. So we're not sure about our program for the next few years. But somehow or another, that program's going to be directed toward influencing broad policy-type decisions in higher education.

In terms of accomplishments, some would say that we have a rather meager record so far. On paper, perhaps, that's the case, but I think I would disagree that it's entirely a weak record. We did make quite an impression on the legislature with our lobbying effort this time, and made friends with a number of legislature members that were quite willing to listen to us. We gave gotten ourselves more organized here at UNR, and are able to accomplish things. For instance, in a day and a half, we secured the signatures of 240 professional faculty members for a petition that Was given to the legislature on collective bargaining bills. That takes a certain amount of organization to be able to do that. We also cemented relationships with the other campuses more than they have been for a while, particularly since the new code was put into effect which destroyed the Coordinating Council. We also found that we can effectively speak for faculty in a lot of areas. We got opportunities from the news media to speak on matters. We got a very good reception from legislature members, as I mentioned already. And interestingly enough, I think our reception with the administration is improving. They came to be much more friendly toward us as the legislative session proceeded, because it became very obvious to them that we did have more political influence in Carson City than they apparently considered we had.

Maybe they didn't understand your aims, to begin with, and suddenly they realized it wasn't just economic.

That's right. I think, hopefully, there'll be some response along those lines.

In terms of disappointments contrasted to our accomplishments, I would have to say that I was disappointed not to get our collective bargaining bill through the legislature. we had a bill cosponsored by Senators Swobe, Wilson, and Bryan, SB499, that would have simply added us to the current public employee negotiations law, commonly known as the Dodge Act. We felt that we could go under this law, and it would be workable, and that that would at least be a way to start the process of collective bargaining in this state.

When we got to the legislature, we found a very strong push on the part of most of the public employer groups—that is, school boards, cities, the University, and the state government—to try to change that basic act in a way that made the act unpalatable for us. The way they wanted to change it involved a scope of bargaining. There's a problem, a built-in problem, in trying to put all public employees under the same negotiations law. The problem arises from the fact that some public employees are professional educators, but most of them are not. And to treat them all the same way, and assume that all they're interested in is salary and fringe benefits, is a serious mistake. Well, the old Dodge Act, which was passed in '69 and amended in '71 to put binding arbitration in it, says that you can bargain about wages, hours, and conditions of employment. And for teachers—schoolteachers k[indergarten] through [grade] twelve— they have gotten that phrase “conditions of employment” interpreted fairly broadly by the EMRB, the Employee Management Relations Board

in the state, and had won some very nice decisions from their point of view that said, in effect, “Your conditions of employment involve professional concerns, educational policy concerns,” like class size. They were told they could bargain on class size. The school board immediately took them to court on that, and it’s still in court. Given the kind of interpretations they were getting from the EMRB, we felt we could live under that law, but we got to Carson City and found this very strong pressure to change the scope of bargaining in that law. And so we ended up helping the schoolteachers kill a very onerous bill, SB650, which had one or two nice features in it, not the least of which was that it would have included us in collective bargaining, but it had this very narrow scope of bargaining. And on the last day of testimony before the assembly committee, everyone in the state, the major employer groups—the state government, school boards, the trustees, city government, and even the chancellor of the University—testified in favor of the bill, as did two major employee groups. The policemen and firemen had their lobbyist there testifying for it, and the state employees [classified] had their lobbyist there testifying for it. The only people that opposed it were the NSEA people. Dick Morgan and Ed Psaltis testified against it, and I testified against it, saying that if the scope provisions could not be broadened, we’d prefer to not have the right to collectively bargain. The bill was killed in committee by a vote of six to one immediately thereafter.

I can go into a little background on that in a moment. But the fact that the bill was killed was a disappointment, and tied with that is the disappointment that some people in our state want to really narrowly define the scope of bargaining when it comes to education. That is a very great disappointment, which could

mean that we will never enter into collective bargaining here, if we can’t talk about those things.

They’d rather give you the right to strike?

That’s right. We’ll talk about that, too, [laughing] a little.

We could [first] move into a little more detailed discussion of the legislative session, what happened down there. When we organized last year, it became a first priority item to get included under the Public Employee Negotiations Act. We decided, as a matter of policy, that we would not comment on other bills in the legislature, but would focus our efforts in this one direction. It’s worth noting that there were between twenty-five and thirty-five other bills introduced that dealt directly with the University, many of which we could have testified on with no problem, because there was obviously a faculty position to take on them, and no faculty were down there to take any kind of position. It was just the administrative people testifying from their point of view.

Well, we let the administration know that we were going to do this [get a bill introduced]. And we worked out a situation with Senator Swobe to introduce the bill, and the cosponsors on the bill. We also had talked with Assemblywoman Gojack about introducing our bill. And Swobe eventually introduced the bill for us, SB499, cosponsored by Wilson and Bryan. We were fairly pleased at the time, because we had north-south support, Bryan being from Las Vegas, Wilson and Swobe being from the north; and we also had bipartisan support, Democrats’ and Republicans’ support, on the bill.

Then, much to our surprise—perhaps we shouldn’t’ve been surprised, but being fairly naive, we *were* surprised—the administration

introduced their own bill, SB453. They had, in October, hired a man named Tom Exley to be their labor negotiator. They were advertising for an experienced labor negotiator for the system, and they hired him. Their advertisements carried a salary of up to \$22,000. We don't know what Exley's making, but we thought it was of interest that this kind of decision was being made, and that kind of money being spent, for collective bargaining when, in fact, we didn't have the right to collectively bargain yet, and weren't assured of it.

Anyway, apparently, what Exley did when he came in October [was] start to work writing a bill, and 453 is really a beautiful bill from the point of view of the administration, extremely inflexible and rigorous in terms of how you get recognized, and how you can get your recognition withdrawn, in terms of the things you can bargain for. It had a very narrow definition of conditions of employment, even narrower than SB650, as a matter of fact. It also had some very uninformed provisions concerning exclusion of department chairmen from bargaining units, in an attempt to separate out the chairmen from the main group of faculty. And this was really a surprise. I finally became personally convinced that some of our administrators simply did not know how departments operate. It was patently obvious that either they were lying or they didn't understand, and I later became convinced that they didn't understand. From our point of view, that provision alone would have really decimated our organization, and we felt that they had done it deliberately, to try to decimate the organization. We have about fifteen [department] chairmen out of our eighty-some odd members, and five of those are officers or executive board members, including this year's president and myself.

We're both chairmen, and there're three other chairmen on the executive board. So, we felt that was a deliberate attempt to destroy our organization, and said so.

The bill, SB453, also did not have what we considered to be any meaningful way to resolve the impasse on collective bargaining. They allowed us to go to fact finding, which is, you know, the two parties hire a so-called neutral fact finder to examine the situation and make recommendations. But in SB453, the recommendations were not binding on any matters, and also, that the report would never be made public unless both parties agreed to it, which was a way to avoid having us try to seek public support for anything.

So, from start to finish, the bill was just terrible, and was developed apparently by this Mr. Exley without any consultation with faculty groups, a point that the chancellor had to admit in front of the committee, the Federal, State, and Local Governments Committee, and the Governmental Affairs Committee of the assembly. When this bill was introduced, we, of course, very quickly decided to testify about that bill, and shortly thereafter, we got SB499 introduced as well. We went to the hearings. At the hearings, the first hearings that were held, I testified as president-elect of NSP, speaking for NSP on UNR campus; Charles Levinson, the NSP president from Las Vegas, testified; Anne Howard, AAUP president this year from UNR, testified in opposition to 453 and supported 499; and Joe Crowley, chairman of the [Faculty] Senate, testified as an individual, explaining why he was a member of NSP, and why he was opposed to 453 and in favor of 499. And one of his comments I still recall. When he was testifying, he said that if SB453 was passed, it would not give us any more rights or privileges than we had had, but that we would have to pay in the future for what

we were now doing. And so, on that basis, he personally took a position in opposition to the bill. He had also consulted with the Faculty Senate chairman from UNLV and indicated that he was opposed to 453 and supporting 499.

Shortly thereafter, we started a petition drive, which, as I've already indicated, was quite successful, from our point of view, getting about 240 signatures of professional faculty in a day and a half. These petitions were presented to the committee. The chancellor, then, made some comments that he thought they should disregard the petitions because the people that signed them didn't know what they were signing; and I testified immediately thereafter, pointing out that I didn't think 240 professional people would sign a petition if they didn't know what they were signing, and that I thought that was an insult. We had several differences of opinion, as you might imagine, during the course of the testimony. That was one of them.

Testimony on those bills continued for a number of days. I, personally, was very surprised at how the legislative process really works. I'd never been to a state legislature before, and I made the naive assumption that you went down one time and told them the "truth," and they voted for you, and you went home. And the fact of the matter is, I was down there part of twenty days during the last month, lobbying for our bill. I did not miss any of my classes, and met most, if not all, my committee responsibilities. But because Carson City is so close, I was able to go down for parts of days, and ended up going down there some twenty days during that time period, and learned a great deal about how the political process works in this state.

As I said, the testimony continued. There was a great argument about which of the bills should be dealt with. There were eleven

or twelve bills dealing with public employee negotiations introduced. We, at one point, had enough votes to support our position, SB499. We gained that support, from our point of view, for several reasons. One reason is that—to sound idyllic for a moment—I think our cause was just, and some people recognized that. And the other thing is that the administration blew it in several ways.

I don't know who was advising them, but they did several things that I would never have thought of doing had I been running their side of the show. One thing is they introduced a bill in the first place without any faculty consultation, and were forced to admit that to the committee upon questioning. Another thing they did is, in testimony, they said the governor supported their bill, and then they were forced to recant publicly, saying that the governor was adopting a neutral position on collective bargaining in higher education. And it really made them look foolish to say that. Chancellor Humphrey said, in fact, that the governor supported SB453, whereupon some of us went to the governor and asked him [laughing], through some of his advisors, if this were the case. They were shocked that this was being said, and it wasn't very long at all until the matter was straightened out, and Chancellor Humphrey was politically embarrassed over it, having to read a public statement admitting that he had made some kind of mistake. They also made a very large tactical blunder in saying, in testimony, that rather than give us binding arbitration, they would prefer to give us the right to strike. They were so interested in this, in fact, that they eventually introduced a bill, SB568, that was exactly like 453, except it had some very limited strike provisions. It was really kind of a joke. They literally pay you off and fire you if you strike, with no provisions for necessarily rehiring you, nothing said about that. All your benefits, up to the day you

strike, are paid to you. It doesn't say in the bill you're fired, but that's the equivalent of it. And they also said you could picket on the streets around the University, but not on the University campus, and a bunch of other stuff like that—just really *far out* stuff.

But when the administration said in testimony that they would rather have us strike than go to binding arbitration, it really left a bad taste in the mouth of some of the legislature members. They had worked very long and hard on a bill for public employees, that for two years' time had avoided strikes in the public sector. And here, all of a sudden, you see an employer group in the public sector, a very important one, sitting down and saying, "We'd rather have 'em shut down the University than go to binding arbitration." And it made them look very foolish in the eyes of some legislature members, to be blunt about it, and helped swing support our way.

I don't recall the date, but eventually, we did secure four out of seven votes, which is what is needed to get a "Do Pass" on a bill. However, the chairman of the committee, Senator Gibson from Henderson, I think, realized this, and he simply delayed calling a meeting. And we went nine days without a meeting of that committee [Federal, State, and Local] in the senate, with that on the agenda. He controls the meeting times and the agenda for the meetings. We lined up our four votes and expected to get 499 out very quickly, but we just simply couldn't get a meeting called. I came to a new appreciation of what it means to say that the legislature works on a committee system, because that's really what it means. It means that the chairman has a great deal of power, and even in a situation like we had, where we had four out of seven votes and could have gotten a "Do Pass" on a bill, we simply couldn't get it out of committee.

During that nine-day period, the chairman of that committee, with a couple of members of the committee, Senator Dodge, and Senator Walker from Las Vegas, worked out with some representatives of management, particularly a man named Kevin Ephromsen, who is a representative of the Clark County School Board. [He's the one that argues with the schoolteachers in Vegas, and he's also, by the way, the guy that shut down the test site for such a long period of time; he kept the unions out on strike there by refusing to negotiate with them. He is a very powerful figure in this state, in terms of labor law and labor policy.] He sat down with Gibson and wrote this bill, which is quite similar in many ways to a bill he had gotten introduced during the session, SB370. What they did is, since twelve bills were introduced, use this as a reason, somewhat justifiably, to try to come up with one bill that pulled everybody together. And that would've been all right, if they'd've respected certain differences between groups; but they did not. The bill eventually came to be known as SB650.

Well, what happened is that the bill was introduced, after this nine-day period, by Gibson. It was just handed out one night at a committee meeting, and then he said, "We'll talk about it later, after you've had a chance to read it." And it involved the University under nonbinding arbitration, because he was opposed to binding arbitration for the University, as was Senator Dodge. So they put it in like this.

Well, we came back for testimony the next night, knowing we still had four votes. I was there to testify for it, and I had been in contact with our Las Vegas people and Elko people. Procter Hug, [Jr.] was there with Mr. Exley to testify concerning the administration position. Apparently, they did not understand that we had four votes, and this is really

funny, the way it worked out. I testified, and told them that there were some things that we didn't like about the bill, the scope of bargaining was too narrow [this was the first time we saw this limited scope of bargaining], and the department chairman problem, and that we wanted binding arbitration instead of advisory, as they had in this bill.

And then Procter Hug and Mr. Exley testified, saying that they didn't like the bill, either, but they didn't like it because it wasn't as strong as SB453 or SB568, which they still preferred. And the things I said I liked about SB650, they, right after me, went along and said they didn't like them.

When they finished testifying, Senator Gibson asked for the pleasure of the committee, whereupon Senator Swobe made a motion that, as a matter of policy, the committee go on record supporting SB499 or the equivalent, if they went with the new bill, which, in substance, meant that if they went with this new bill, they would give us binding arbitration. Senator Foley from Vegas seconded that. Gibson called for a vote, and it passed, four to two. Gibson and Dodge were voting against it, Senator Hecht, Senator Foley, Senator Drakulich, Senator Swobe voting for it. And it was really funny, because the general counsel for the regents didn't understand what had happened. He just did not believe we had any votes. And about two minutes after the vote was taken, he finally stood up and said something to the equivalent of, "What did you just do? I don't understand what just happened." Whereupon they told him, He kind of got agitated, and giving his spiel over again, and making all kinds of points. For instance, they focused on the constitutional question, the fact that it would be unconstitutional for them to go to binding arbitration because they're a constitutional entity set up to govern the University, and nobody has to tell them

what to do. This was one of their big pitches all through it, and there was severe disagreement on that point. He got wound up about that, and finally, in a nice way, Senator Gibson had to just tell him that the discussion was over, the vote had been taken. And he was just very disturbed, came up to me afterwards and kinda shook his head, and said, "You guys had the votes, didn't you?"

And my only comment was, "I think we did." [laughing]

So, it was really funny to let them see some strength that we were able to engender.

Then, as you might imagine, the administration brought a great deal of pressure to bear on certain people in the senate, including certain people on that committee, and by the weekend, had managed to convince a couple of people to change their votes. And this'll be made public in more ways than this—and, personally, I hope it does hurt some people that changed their votes. Eventually, as I understand it— and I had to go out of town that weekend, and I wasn't around when it all happened—but as I understand it, Senator Drakulich and Senator Hecht changed their vote, in some ways that are, from my point of view, still questionable in terms of the rules of the senate. That decision made by Senator Swobe was reconsidered, and they voted to give us nonbinding arbitration and leave us under the bill [SB 650]. Well, that bill came out of the senate committee, finally.

Oh, there's one other interesting thing that happened in the testimony. There was a great disagreement about department chairmen, and the committee knew that they had done us—done us, I say, the faculty, in, with reference to the vote on binding arbitration, and a couple of them felt a little bad about that, so they were willing to give a little on

department chairmen. And so one night, they were having a closed meeting with a bunch of lobbyists down the hall, and they called the chancellor and myself in. I sat down, and they said, "We're discussing this department chairman question, and we'd like to know how you run your department." So I told them that the way I run my department is a majority rule model, and that everything we do, in terms of recommendations to the dean, is decided by the department. Everything. I don't make an independent recommendation. I never have in the year that I've been chairman. And that involves promotions, salary, tenure, policy matters—everything. We arrive at whatever the majority wants, and then I forward it to the dean under my signature, and I admitted that. From some points of view, I'm just a glorified secretary.

Chancellor Humphrey was incredulous, to put it mildly. He just did *not* know what happened. Most departments do that. I was able to say that, in fact, ninety percent of the departments on campus operate in that fashion. Apparently, there are some exceptions on campus, including some in the College of Agriculture, which operates more along the lines of a "headship" than a chairmanship. Then, when I finished my testimony, they asked the chancellor if he had anything to add, and he made some kind of lame comment that they thought we were administrators, and they reimbursed us for administrating by giving us released time from teaching. But he turned and said to me, "If that's how Jim runs his department, then he is not an administrator," which is the point I was trying to make. And he was forced to admit that. He did say "if," but he was forced to admit the point.

The next day, the chancellor came back loaded for bear. This time he had Procter Hug, Tom Exley, President Miller, and himself

there to testify, and he put President Miller in something of a touchy spot by asking him to testify that chairmen don't really operate like that, and that they're administrators, and consider themselves administrators. And I really felt rather sorry for President Miller to be on such a spot, because there was no way he could win. If he pleased me, or the faculty groups, he upset the chancellor; if he pleased the chancellor, he upset faculty groups. He chose to please the chancellor. I didn't even bother to argue with his comments because, again, to be candid, I noticed that several on the committee were not even paying attention when he was testifying. But before that, the chancellor had offered a compromise, which we accepted, and that is that they would leave the decision on department chairmen to the EMRB, and that we'd make our case before the EMRB. In the meantime, he would try to get the policy straightened out with the Board of Regents, because he had found out in the interim that there are several different ways chairmen are selected, and there're several different ways they're viewed, and it's a very inconsistent picture.

He lost some more points with the committee by demonstrating publicly that he didn't know how the chairmen were selected and how they run their departments. And they, in fact, were making jokes about this after the time when the two of us testified.

But anyway, we finally got SB650 out of committee with that compromise position on chairmen. It came to the senate. The schoolteachers were very upset about certain provisions. And there was a vote taken to not consider it immediately. It was finished [in committee] on Friday on Friday morning, and they introduced it Friday afternoon in the senate. There was a vote that ended up ten to ten not to even consider it that day, because many of 'em didn't have a chance to read it,

and talk to people, and find out what they thought. Harry Reid broke the tie in favor of hearing it that day, whereupon we had about forty-five minutes to an hour of discussion of the bill, and questions about the bill.

Senator Dodge was brilliant. He's an opponent on this issue, but he was really brilliant in explaining the bill from the point of view of management. And he really made the schoolteachers look like money-hungry buffoons, or something. Finally, it passed the senate, nineteen to one, and the schoolteachers were beginning to get very nervous because the scope provision was so narrow that they just saw years of work going down the drain. Jack Norris, who was president of the Nevada Classroom Teachers' Association last year, was present the next day and pointed out that they would lose—I think he said thirteen out of twenty-one items in their contract if that bill became law. And it was that way all across the state, that all the teachers' contracts would never be the same again, in terms of provisions.

Well, the bill went to the assembly Government Affairs Committee then, and they started testimony immediately, four o'clock—four-thirty—Friday. [They] heard first from Mr. Efromsen, and from someone else, and then came back at ten o'clock the next morning, taking testimony from all representatives of employer groups in the state, and representatives of employee groups—state classified, Mr. Gagnier, and Mr. Hendrickson, who was representing the police and firemen—all these testifying in favor of the bill.

Now, he [Efromsen] had gotten these employee groups to go in favor of the bill by offering them amendments that they liked. It was really so patently obvious what had happened. These two representatives would sit down to testify, and they'd say, "We have these

two or three amendments that we'd like on 650, and if they're put in there, we'll support it."

Then Mr. Efromsen would speak up, and he'd say [without even asking 'em to read, or anything] —he'd say, "Those amendments are acceptable to us." And so he bought those employee groups off.

The whole previous week, he'd been trying to put pressure on me. I'd been lobbied by a lobbyist. He and some others had come to me trying to get me to support SB650, pointed out that if it [SB650] died, we wouldn't have the right to bargain about anything, and suggesting that we should accept the narrow scope of bargaining and come back next year and try to change it, but at least be bargaining in the interim over some things. And I never did tell him what I was going to do.

It became very obvious, when they finished testifying, Mr. Joe Dini, chairman of that committee, asked if there were any more proponents of the bill to testify, and I didn't say anything. Then he asked for opponents to the bill, whereupon Dick Morgan, the executive director of NSEA, went forward to testify, along with Ed Psaltis, the executive secretary of the Washoe County Teachers' Association. They testified against the bill, asking it to be killed. And I testified against the bill, saying that I would prefer that the bill be killed if it couldn't be amended to broaden the scope of bargaining. I commented that we would accept the nonbinding arbitration, and that we would accept a compromise on department chairmen, but that we couldn't live with the narrow scope.

The chancellor, in his testimony before this committee and the senate committee, had made a great deal about other channels whereby the faculty have influence on educational policy, pointed out the structure of the senate, and all this kind of thing. And

my comment was, "If the senate is such a favorable instrument, and is so workable, then why have previous senate chairmen joined NSP and helped organize it? And why do we have seven of the last nine senate chairmen as members of NSP?" I decided not to go into issues, but just used that statistic.

[After] my testimony, Mr. Dini said, "What is your pleasure?"

Jim Ullom from Las Vegas said, "I vote that we indefinitely postpone this bill." Eileen Brookman seconded, and it passed six to one, so the bill was dead.

Mr. Dini then ordered us to talk until four o'clock to see if a compromise was possible. We had lunch, and then everybody met in one of the lounges up there, and there was just no give anywhere—no give on scope. Everybody realized that the other matters, like a hearing officer, were not the issue. But there was no way of giving on scope for anybody. so we went back at four o'clock and told them that the ball game was over, as far as we were concerned. There was no compromise. Dick Morgan stood and said, "We couldn't reach a compromise," Mr. Efromsen stood and said, "We can't reach a compromise," whereupon the bill stayed dead.

The next few days, there was tremendous pressure brought to bear on the members of that committee to revive that bill. Trustees from all over the state, school trustees, all kinds of management people were lobbying to get that bill revived because it represented their best shot. They'd been losing before the EMRB, and losing in the courts, and so they just wanted to change the law. And all of a sudden, they'd been shot down changing the law, and they were very disappointed, and brought a great deal of pressure to bear. And from the standpoint of educators in this state, the members of that assembly committee became heroes as they withstood this pressure to reconsider that

bill. The members that voted for us on that committee were Dini, Ullom, Brookman, Smith, May, Gojack; and Getto voted against it. He wanted SB650. And as I understand it, Jean Ford did not vote. I think she was favorable to the position of the University and the teachers on it, but she did not vote.

So that's what happened in the legislature. We decided not to try to get another bill for just ourselves introduced because we felt if we introduced any bill that dealt with this chapter of the Nevada statutes, that this would open a door to amendment, and that we might see that scope provision put in. by amendment. And so we just decided not to do anything else. And so the whole issue died, and we don't have the right to collectively bargain now. We received a great deal of help from Senator Swobe in our efforts, and I think that any kind of history of what happened down there should give him the kind of credit he deserves. He has been a friend of the University for a number of years, having served as president of the Alumni Association, being named in '68 as Alumni of the Year. He also co-chaired the first really successful fund drive that the Alumni Association had for this University. And he also, by the way, was the sole sponsor for the bill in the last session of the legislature that got that extra million dollars for the [libraries]. Most people don't know that, but he introduced a bill to give something like \$600,000 over two years to this library, and four hundred-something thousand for the Las Vegas library.

Well, we went to him, knowing, among other things, that it would be very nice if we had bipartisan support for our position in the legislature, and knowing that he would probably be willing to hear our case. We presented our case to him, and he agreed to work for us and with us on the issue because it became obvious to him that there was a

problem of equal treatment of educators in this state, some educators having the right to collectively bargain, and others not. I should also add that he has had considerable trouble accepting some decisions made by the administration of this University, himself, in recent years, and that this probably contributed to his willingness to at least listen to us.

He worked very long and hard for us, helping to line up votes on the federal, state, and local committee for SB499, and working on the senate floor, so that if we had gotten it to the senate floor, I feel sure that it would've passed. He worked closely on the senate floor with Senators Bryan and Foley from Vegas, and there was a point in time when we thought we were going to get on the floor and had lined up enough votes to keep us alive there. I just think he needs to get a great deal of credit, because without him, it would've been a much more difficult task to get as far as we did.

I might make a comment about this trade union notion. It was of interest to note that, consistently in their testimony, the administration representatives always referred to us as the unions. We referred to ourselves variously. That word doesn't have an evil connotation to me, personally. But we like to think of ourselves as a professional organization, as opposed to a trade union, and we felt that they were deliberately using the word union in an attempt to make a few points with some of the legislature members. [This may not be worth keeping on the tape, but it was funny.] During that Saturday, when we were told to sit down and try to compromise, they continued to use that word in discussions, and finally, Dick Morgan, the NSEA executive director, turned to Mr. Exley and asked him if he got some particular

pleasure out of using that word. And Mr. Exley feigned a lack of knowledge on what he meant, and Mr. Morgan said, "Well, if you don't mind, we would prefer that you stop using that word." It was kind of a funny encounter that they had.

We really do have a great deal of trouble with our image on campus, though, because we are, from a certain perspective, a union. There's no doubt about that because of the similarities with trade unions, but in terms of the kinds of things we're interested in, and [under] the terms that we were organized, and in terms of the way we govern ourselves, I think it's much closer to the model that you might think of with reference to AAUP. We're interested in educational policy matters. We just simply don't think the old methods of "meet and confer," and, you know, the model of "one big, happy family" running the University works any more. There've been too many disagreements with the administration over the last couple of years. So we think of ourselves much differently there.

One other comment might be interjected in the discussion of the National Society of Professors and what it plans to do in the future. I just returned from the state convention of NSEA this past weekend, which was held at Tonopah. I was one of four delegates from higher education, two from the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, and two from here, plus one representative from the community college at Elko. We went to this meeting not knowing how we'd be received. We do represent a small minority in this very large group, and we had not achieved the right to collectively bargain. We didn't know how they'd receive us, but their reception to us would, I think, mean a lot in terms of our future with them, because some people want to try to develop the senate as a better way of influencing educational policy, and

other people want to develop a group that's independent of all these. We affiliated with NEA as a good alternative because they do have political muscle in this state, and they have a battery of attorneys, nationally, that can help with lawsuits, and this kind of thing, plus they're a professional education organization.

Well, we went to Tonopah and were very well received. They agreed, for instance, to our request to lower state dues by twenty-seven dollars for the coming year to give us a break on maintaining our organization during the year when we don't have the right to collectively bargain. They also supported some resolutions we put forward, one involving a study of how part-time people in all levels of education are paid. The salary schedule, for instance, for part-time teachers in the community college is a disgrace. That's about the kindest thing you could say about it. There was a joking move in the senate recently to request that they stop calling it a salary schedule and call it tips, or something like that.

We also put forward a resolution asking for their continued support in organizing the campuses and in getting the collective bargaining bill changed in the next session of the legislature. They agreed with that.

We put forward a resolution asking that they support us in our attempts to investigate possible legal avenues with reference to the University code that was forced upon the faculty. They agreed to do this, and, in fact, some of their attorneys are even now looking at the situation to see if there is some value in filing a suit on behalf of at least our membership, if not the entire faculty, to enjoin that code. I don't know whether this will or will not take place, but they supported a resolution that would, in fact, commit NEA and NSEA to helping us investigate these possibilities.

So, because of this, I'm willing to predict that NSP will continue to be a vigorous organization during the next two years. Even if we do not enter into collective bargaining, there are other things we can do, and I just think that we will survive.

Now, to move from that, you mentioned the Adamian case here in your outline. [RGH: This is optional.] I don't mind talking about it. At the time Adamian was fired, it was obvious to many people on the faculty that he was a scapegoat, kind of a sacrificial lamb to the public in this state. A very minor event, by comparison, occurred on this campus. President Miller told me privately that if the kind of thing that happened here on Governor's Day had occurred at Michigan, where he was before he came here, that there would've been an editorial in the downtown paper praising God for a peaceful week. But that's not what happened in Nevada, as you remember.

The media, having little else to write about, or talk about in this state, decided to make an issue of this, and really ended up sacrificing a mild-mannered, soft-spoken individual, Dr. Paul Adamian, to the public, and they helped create the opinion in that public, an opinion that even pervades the University. Most people that don't know Adamian, or were not there during the Governor's Day disturbance, accept or give at least partial credence to the media treatments of the thing. And they were just so biased that it's unbelievable.

Well, a number of faculty felt that he was, in fact, a scapegoat, an example. This was admitted by the Board of Regents in the meeting that terminated him. A number of students and faculty submitted what they called a complicity statement, saying, in effect, "If you're going to fire him, fire us, too, because we did the same thing." Several faculty signed that statement, and a number of students. I'll never forget Regent Knudtsen,

Molly Knudtsen, spoke up and said, “Why *did* we select out Adamian? That question never occurred to me.”

And Regent Fred Anderson spoke up and said, in effect, “We did select him for an example, to teach people that this is not acceptable behavior on the University campus.” And there was an open admission of that fact in the public meeting.

Well, when what I would call a conservatively oriented faculty group hears all the evidence and recommends that the man be censured and not fired, then to go ahead and do what they did, fire him, is just really unthinkable. They fired him. The document of termination, the report from them, that they presented that day, was a nine-page statement that made no reference at all to any faculty document. In other words, they didn’t say anything at all about, “We’re firing you under the provision of the University code, thus and such.” The only document referred to in there was the President’s Advisory Commission on Campus Unrest, which is not exactly a legal document in the state of Nevada. So everyone knew they were extremely vulnerable for a lawsuit, and a number of faculty supported, through financial contributions, the building of a legal defense fund, whereby he eventually was able to go to court. It took about a year to get enough money together, and also, to find an attorney that was willing to handle this very hot case. We eventually went with Charlie Springer, who has done, I think, a fairly good job in handling the case since he took it over.

Those of us deeply involved in it, [who] know exactly what happened and how it was done, never had any qualms about the case would go in our favor at some level. We were a little bit pleasantly surprised recently when a part of the case was decided in our favor at the level it was, and decided so quickly and

summarily. I shouldn’t say quickly, because it took him [Federal District Judge, Roger Foley] so long to make a decision. The case was heard on December the fourth, 1972, and he finally rendered a decision here in April, and that’s a long time to wait. There were all kinds of rumors floating around about “Why this delay?” and what not. But he did decide in favor on certain points of the case. Parts of it are still to be heard. But that case will be very interesting. It helped, certainly, establish tenure rights more solidly than they had been established.

There was a previous case back in the ’50’s, the Richardson case,* where they had also fired a tenured professor, and they’d lost that one, as well. And in recent years, they had also lost *my* Richardson case, and the case of Wendell Mordy, the previous head of DRI; and they’d lost the Winterberg case, as well. So they weren’t doing too well in court. And it’s going to get expensive for the regents eventually, for those that keep voting to do things like fire Adamian, because there are court precedents that say they’re personally, individually, liable for damages when they do this. So if they lose the \$75,000 damage part of the Adamian suit, the regents that voted against him in the meeting will have to cough up their share of that \$75,000. If I were a regent, I would replace counsel or stop firing people, one or the two [laughing].

It isn’t a judgment, then, against the administration. It’s against the Board of Regents, as persons?

Right.

I don’t understand the legal things, but that just happens to be the way that it will be,

*Frank Richardson, professor of biology in the 1940s - 50s.

because there are court precedents. In fact, I understand that that's one of the reasons they were willing to settle my case out of court. I understand that they became convinced they were going to lose it, and would've had to cough up some money individually. I think I was suing for \$10,000 damages, and that would've been, you know, maybe \$1,000 apiece, or \$1,500 apiece. But Adamian's a different matter; \$75,000's a pretty good chunk of money.

He's been drawing twenty-eight dollars a month from the Coast Guard for a ten percent disability, so the University will have to cough up some back salary on him, also. I understand they are going to appeal the decision. I think that that's a waste of taxpayers' money because I'm convinced they're going to lose when they appeal.

They'll lose in court, but they wouldn't lose with public opinion in the state, though.

No, that's true, and that's why they're doin' it, I think, to say they've done all they could.

The year that we [have] just about completed here at the University, from the point of view of most people, has been a relatively quiet year in terms of the number of drastic events that have occurred on campus and the amount of media coverage given to them. From the standpoint of others, however, it might be considered an eventful year, and the dearth of things in the newspaper or on television is simply a comment on news coverage in the area. A number of things have happened. Lawsuits have been carried forward and won, and that, itself, is worth comment on news coverage. Most reporters are even unaware of the fact that other lawsuits have been filed, and they're certainly unaware of any kind of pattern that might be developing in terms of the meaning of these

lawsuits. I think that they're probably the most important thing that's happened, from the faculty's point of view, in a long time.

Other things have been going on within the University. The Human Relations Commission, which I chaired last year, was involved in pushing forward the Affirmative Action plan, which was adopted this year, and represented a very large step for the University to take. That has implications, particularly for minorities and for women in terms of the future of the University. It also was very supportive last year of something called a qualifying program, a program whereby people who otherwise would not be qualified could attend the University. This program was delayed a year, as President Miller decided whether or not to support it, but he has finally decided within the last week to take that program to the Board of Regents and recommend it to them, emphasizing the fact that it would be a program that could serve Vietnam veterans.

It's worth noting in this regard that there was a resolution introduced by Senator Swobe in the legislature that did pass the legislature, requesting that the University make all efforts to serve Vietnam veterans as they're trying to come back to the University, and that this resolution had something to do with President Miller's decision to go ahead and push the qualifying program, so I was pleased to see that occur.

From my point of view, personally, a major other important event that occurred was the continued development of NSP on campus. It's become an organization more familiar to faculty. We've gotten a little better handle on things and had a very interesting time in the legislature, as I've pointed out. We're meeting within the next week or two to decide on future plans. Again, from my personal point of view, this is one of the more interesting

events of recent years at the University, to see a faculty group set itself up independent of the University structure—that is to say, the senate—and tried to move outside the usual channels in the University to accomplish things, both by going to the media and the legislature.

There has been a very small amount of activity with reference to students. I think this is mainly due to very few events happening outside the University that were thought of as very important—no new bombing of Cambodia, or anything like that. We've gotten used to bombing Cambodia now, so nobody gets excited about it. It has been a quiet year from the point of view of most students.

[Editor's note: Because of important events occurring after the initial interview on April 30, a second taping session Was held on June 15, 1973.]

The funding controversy in which a number of us have been involved requires some explanation. I would like to start with a chronology of events as I saw them, and as I participated in them, and perhaps as I go along, I'll make some substantive comments about why the problems developed.

The [Faculty] Senate and the faculty as a whole found out sometime in late April that the work program for UNR was going to involve rather substantial cuts in some areas of the University, particularly in the college of Arts and Science, while the Medical School was going to receive an additional large amount of support, going from just a few thousand dollars of state support to a \$283,000 level for next year. This came as a surprise to most of the University because the representatives of the faculty, particularly the Faculty Senate chairman, Joe Crowley, had been repeatedly told that the budget request that went to the governor was not to

be considered binding, and that we should not get upset. In fact, he was told at one point that to discuss it, with its reallocations of monies, would simply alarm the faculty unnecessarily. He had stated this in front of a meeting of the National Society of Professors, and also to the Board of Regents' meeting which occurred in May. We found out, approximately ten days before the Board of Regents' meeting in May, that the work program did, in fact, include those reallocations, and we had a very short time to do something about it.

The senate met the week of the regents' meeting, and passed, by very strong votes, resolutions taking issue with the work program. One expressed extreme concern at the financial situation of UNR, and the other was more directly related to the medical school, suggesting that the funds going to that unit of the University were going to really hurt other units of the University.

The senate representatives then went to the regents' meeting, along with me, as a representative of the National Society of Professors, and we spoke to the regents about the work program. Joe Crowley delivered a very forceful statement about the problem, and then I delivered a statement.* A number of other faculty members and deans participated in this discussion, which took up six hours of time at the Board of Regents' meeting in May.

The upshot of all this was that no action Was taken, which was the original understanding, anyway, but we did, we think, inform the Board of Regents a great deal about the financial problems at UNR, and we hope we informed the public, through the media, to a certain extent about these problems. During

*Copies of these statements can be found in the University Archives.

the course of that meeting, the regents, who were quite receptive, on the whole, to the presentations, indicated that they would be happy to receive other information about financial problems at UNR.

We went back to our campus groups, and a joint meeting was held the week after the regents' meeting, a meeting involving the executive boards of the Faculty Senate, the AAUP, and NSP. This meeting was held to decide if further action would be taken in an attempt to get the work program changed. It was decided that further action would be taken, and that it would be in the form of a campus-wide survey of the effects of the financial problems of UNR on the various functions of UNR, particularly the teaching function. We set up a campus-wide committee, with people from all of the colleges and schools, to gather data from those in authority in the departments and schools. [Usually, this meant department chairmen were interviewed.] We developed a questionnaire of four or five questions, asking, "What kinds of programs do you have? What are you being asked to do by the state of Nevada, in terms of education?" And then we asked about budget cuts that have occurred since the year 1970-71, because the year '71-72 was when we took our biggest cut in operating funds, the first year under which we had to use the twenty-to-one budgeting formula.

This subcommittee worked extremely hard. The administration of the University cooperated with it by furnishing budget requests by the various departments and schools, and also giving us information on the administration's recommendation. [That committee served as a subcommittee of a greater committee, made up of the three executive boards.]

At the senate meeting the next week, this rather unique and ad hoc situation

was discussed, and resolutions were passed affirming the Senate Executive Board's participation in this study, and empowering them to make recommendations to the Board of Regents, based on the findings of the study. At that senate meeting, the two senators who are also serving as presidents of AAUP and NSP [Anne Howard, AAUP; me, NSP] indicated that both of those organizations would defer to the Faculty Senate executive board leadership in developing a presentation to the Board of Regents. This was done because we [the NSP] have been accused by some, particularly in the system administration, of using the budget problems as a ploy to organize the faculty into a union. That accusation is very far from the truth, and represents a basic misunderstanding on the part of the system administration, but it had been made, so the two faculty groups that are referred to by the system administration as unions publicly deferred to the executive board of the senate. The senate carried the ball from then on, and the executive boards of the AAUP and NSP did not meet again in an official way. The executive board of the senate headed up the work.

That executive board, then, in the next week, with the help of some other people, put together a very large document that was campus-wide in its scope, and was based on the information we gathered in our interviews. From that document, a series of recommendations were developed. Our first and major recommendation was that all instructional departments, and some support departments, as well, be allowed to go back to operating dollars that they had in the '70-71 fiscal year. That seems a strange recommendation until you realize that no academic department of this University has as much money for operating as it did in that year, and that's demonstrated by the table that

the Faculty Senate put together. The cuts are dramatic. The overall difference is illustrated by the fact that the operating budgets for departments at UNR are nine percent lower than they were, on the average, in '70-71, and this is, of course, in a time of spiraling inflation.

Our second recommendation involved leaving policies about allocation of research and training grant overhead funds the same. We currently have a policy that allows a portion of these overhead funds to go back to the department of the principal investigator of the grant. These funds are very useful, being used to support research, as seed money, and in some cases, directly supporting teaching. A recommendation was included in the work program to halve the amount of money in these two instances that would go to the principal investigator's department. The other portion would go into the general fund of the University.

Then we had a recommendation involving the fact that state support should be guaranteed for instructional programs that stand to lose federal support. This, of course, will be a recommendation that would cover the medical school, as well, because they have a lot of federal support.

Our fourth recommendation involved finding certain essential classified [or] professional people and getting state support for them in the coming year. We suggested setting up a faculty-administration committee that would look again at the budget requests of various departments to see whether or not some of those people that were cut were really not essential, and should be funded from state funds.

So there were four recommendations about needed monies. Then we made three recommendations about where to get them. Our first recommendation involved going

to the Interim Finance Committee of the legislature. A number of things have happened since the legislature met, leading us to think that they might be receptive to a request for additional funds. We think, for instance, that our power bill is going to be increased by \$150,000, and that wasn't in the budget request. We think we've found, through our studies, some needs that simply should be met by the state, needs which the state may not have been aware of at the time they [the governor and the legislature] passed the budget. Also, the loss in federal funds that's being anticipated by a number of units on campus is another area that the Interim Finance Committee might be willing to cover. Apparently they specifically said that if we lost some funds called Bankhead-Jones funds, we could come back to them for those monies. But we think there are other federal monies that we're losing that are perhaps just as important.

Another recommendation involves the continuing efforts on the part of the University to seek any impounded federal funds. It was not clear to us that the University had, in fact, systematically and completely checked on any and all federal funds being withheld. We felt this should be done, and that a definition of impoundment should be developed, so that faculty members involved in federal programs could tell whether or not their monies were being impounded. We think the University administration's doing a fairly reasonable job at this, but we're encouraging them to be even more systematic.

A third recommendation involved the reallocation of monies within the UNR budget. This is a touchy issue, because it's getting right to the heart of the medical school issue. As has been pointed out by faculty in the last several weeks, the medical school is something that faculty here has never particularly cared for. Warnings were

issued at the time it was started, saying that eventually this would work to the detriment of other programs at UNR. Those warnings, I think, are being borne out, and we are seeing tremendous costs being incurred by the medical school at a time when overall state support for UNR is dropping, in terms of proportion of the total state budget allocated to instructional use at UNR. Next year's request for the medical school is \$520,000.

In the remarks I made to the regents at their meeting in May, I pointed out, also, that, at the time the decision to start a medical school was made, we did not have any idea that we would be trying to budget ourselves, using the twenty-to-one student-faculty ratio. It is a demonstrable fact, as I've said before, that we are probably the only middle-sized public institution in the country granting professional and doctoral degrees that has to use that high of a budgeting formula. If we had known, when the decision was made about the medical school, that we'd be operating under that kind of budgeting formula, I think the decision might've been different.

We developed this study, and we developed these recommendations, and we sent them through channels [talking to the president two times about them] to the chancellor, who in turn submitted them to the Board of Regents members a few days prior to the meeting of June eighth. President Miller did not agree to alter his stance on the work program in any fashion, and, in fact, developed a two-page cover letter that we did not know about until we went to the regents' meeting. His letter ended up being the cover letter for our study and recommendations, and I must admit that this Faculty Senate executive board was disappointed not to know that he had written such a letter and sent it with the study we did.

It's worth mentioning, perhaps, that during the last two or three weeks, we've

had a lot of media coverage on this problem. There was a lot of coverage of the regents' meeting in May, and in the intervening weeks, there's been continuing interest. Stories have come out about the study that the senate was doing, and there were some very good stories about the results of this study, pointing out the problems that UNR is facing. Also, there's been an exchange in the press between Mr. Jessup, director of budget and institutional studies for the system, and myself concerning the overall funding picture in Nevada for higher education. The media was also interested and present at the regents' meeting of June eighth, and wrote some very interesting stories about the results of that meeting.

The June eighth regents' meeting was very interesting. It demonstrated, again, that faculty will be received by the Board of Regents, that their opinions will be listened to, and, in some instances, even heeded, on important issues. It was obvious at the regents' meeting that a number of regents had taken the time to read the materials that were sent to them concerning the faculty study. They spoke from the documents knowledgeably and exhibited great concern for the problems that we had documented.

At the [June eighth] meeting, Jo Deen Flack, Faculty Senate chairman for the coming year, made a presentation about the findings of the study and the general recommendations. Then I made a presentation to the board about the long range budgeting problems.* One of the major points I made was that it's just a matter of time until the UNLV faculty are also complaining about budgeting methods in the system. Right now, they're growing,

*Copy available in the University Archives.

and they're in a situation of prosperity *because of* budgeting methods, but as they develop graduate and professional programs, they'll find out that they can't run them, either, on the kind of money the state is giving because of [the] budgeting methods we use within the system.

Well, after a long discussion about the matter, the eventual vote was five to three. That represented a tremendous moral victory, because, as I understand it, that's the first time there has been a split vote on a system work program. And we came within one vote of stopping the entire work program.

There was an interesting maneuver on the part of those running the meeting. Two regents expressed an interest in voting on the work program as separate parts so that they could vote on the UNR budget and not affect other budgets. They were not allowed to do this. It's my guess that had they been allowed to vote on the UNR work program by itself, the work program would have failed. However, they were forced to vote on the entire system work program, and the vote ended up five to three, which indicates that some regents were very concerned about the problems that we had highlighted. This was quite disturbing, as you might guess, to the administrators who had helped build that budget.

Since the time of the regents' meeting, we've had a Faculty Senate meeting where this issue was brought up, and a report was made. The senate is not going to let the matter drop, I do not think; in fact, they are discussing now setting up a permanent committee for the senate that would be called the budget and institutional studies committee to aid [in getting] information that could be used over the long haul in dealing with budget problems. Also, there will be a meeting next

week of the three executive boards that started this study in motion, and at that point, there may be further decisions about action that might be taken.

it's worth noting that there has been a continuing discussion in the media about the problem, and that even in the last day or two, a member of the state senate Finance Committee [Archie Pozzi] has spoken out on the issue, attacking me personally, and attacking the picture of state support for higher education in Nevada that is presented in the report I prepared at the request of Graduate Council. I'm in the process of preparing a statement* to respond to him, and I don't know exactly what will take place after that. But it is a continuing kind of battle, an attempt on the part of faculty at UNR to make the public, and the legislature, and the administration aware of problems we're facing at the instructional level, and we plan to continue it.

*Copy available in the University Archives.

WOMEN'S ATHLETICS

LUELLA LILLY, DIRECTOR

Luella J. Lilly: I'm Dr. Luella J. Lilly, director of Women's Physical Education, speaking on behalf of women's athletics.

The women's athletic program has improved a great deal, as far as respect in the conference the last two or three years. Nevada was very definitely at the bottom of the league when I arrived here on campus in '69. We have not particularly changed the program, other than that students now have an opportunity to practice more. We have not necessarily increased the number of games that are played or the schools with whom we play, but we have increased the amount of practice time and effort given in coaching.

The philosophy of women's athletics here at the University of Nevada, Reno, is basically that of providing an athletic program for the students that are currently enrolled. I'm always pleased to report that only about fifty percent of the girls that participate on the athletic teams are physical education majors. I think there's possibly a wrong concept that we're really just a program for the physical education majors. This varies in the different

sports, but you could generally say that less than fifty percent—or approximately fifty percent—are non-majors.

I think most people are aware that one of the biggest problems here on our campus is the plant and facilities, with having one gymnasium to run physical education programs, intramurals, men's and women's athletics, and that practice time has been a very major problem. It's my understanding that with the new gymnasium, that the men's athletic program will maintain use of the old gym, and that with the two gym floors in the new facility, that there should be sufficient time then, for the women to practice in whatever sports activity we're having at the time.

I think one of the biggest frustrations, other than facilities, is money. I think that when we say "athletics"—in fact, we've talked many times, in our Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Council, that we would almost like to have some word other than *athletics*, because we feel that we turn of f people, or they're very opinionated, and when they hear the

term *athletics*, they immediately are a pro or con, and our program is *not* similar to the men's program, other than the fact that we are participating in sports, and, of course, we'd like to win. But we do not currently give scholarships there's no recruiting. We make no attempt, other than simply presenting our program to athletes from other schools, and we do not have any sort of active recruiting program. About all we do is include a little flier with registration materials that are sent out to all the new freshman girls, and it simply states that we *have* an athletic program, and to register for the classes, and that's about it. So that's the majority of our publicity for recruiting.

I think that one of the frustrations I've met this year is that as we now are getting more publicity, that it becomes very important as to who's winning and who's losing, and that this is, of course, what the newspapers want to know, and what the television wants to know, and we believe very strongly that it's important that the girls are participating, not necessarily whether they win or lose. And when I say that, I don't mean that we don't want to [win], and that we don't try, but I don't like a program evaluated as to whether we win or lose, because we feel that the program still has a value to the students.

I think, as far as the Faculty Senate report* is concerned, we were very concerned with the fact that athletics were not considered a part of the instructional [program]. In particular, we are at Nevada. It is very instructional. In fact, we start with students that are lesser skilled, possibly, than those that are cut from some of the more advanced schools, and actually teach them the various things. For example, in volleyball, my first day out, I may have five or six out of twenty that have what we call legal hits. As I've said, the first day of practice, we actually have to teach the

girls the skill before we can even worry about coaching them. So it's very instructional as far as the women's program is concerned. In the majority of other schools, the women's athletic program is a part of the women's physical education program, and the entire faculty, even according to our national regulations, the entire women's physical education faculty more or less works as a board of control, and their concepts are very much in line with physical education.

There's been a great deal of criticism, actually, of our national organization, because it is so very conservative, that they don't want the girls to practice too long, they don't want them to participate in very many games. Even for some of the events, from my own background—that, for example, they didn't want anyone to swim over a hundred yards free style [and, of course, it goes all the way up to 1,500 meters at the nationals], but they didn't want to strain or stress anybody. So it really is quite different and quite conservative. So their main objectives are along the line of physical education, rather than competition itself. The national organization is the Division of Girls' and Women's Sports, a part of AAHPER, which is the American Association of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation. That's just a division of it, if you wanted to be technical, rather than a part of it. There're nine divisions, and DGWS is one of 'em.

I think, as far as the major recommendation that affects women's athletics, as far as the Faculty Senate is concerned, is the statement about one athletic board. And I think that the

*The UNR Faculty Senate appointed a committee to study the institution's athletics situation. A copy of the report is available in the University Archives.

role of the board would be very important. As to whether it would be beneficial to the women or not—. With the small number of physical education and staff members that we have for women here, we can't really assume the same role as they have in other schools. So the board is more important at Nevada than it might be at some other school, as far as being an administrative-type board, where faculty members are really discussing the impact of various decisions. So I personally feel that the Women's Athletic Board plays a very, very vital role in the development of our program, and in the control of it, so that is run the way the school wants it to be run, and for the benefit of our students, rather than possibly going off in one direction, with one person at control.

The Commission on the Status of Women's Affirmative Action statement has resulted in a committee [on athletics and recreation] . As of late, there're no real recommendations that have been made, so I can't really state at this time what the results will be from this commission. I think the important thing is that it has brought it to light that possibly the women's athletic program has not had as much stress, and that it's brought it to the light for study. And so, in this sense, it's important.

The Faculty Women's Caucus made some very definite recommendations to the president, and I feel that their impact was heard, possibly the most at this time, of any of the commissions, or boards, or whatever, and that their role was important. They have a lot of different things to be concerned with, and they are still asking for reports, but I feel that their help in the fall resulted directly in changes that were made in the field hockey field so that the softball team could practice, and that this was one of the few real definite, concrete changes that I can see that have occurred during this past year.

But there's been a lot of talk, and a lot of recommendations. It's been in the forefront a lot, but I can't say, really, that anything has been done to improve the program, except for the fact that we now have a softball practice area and that people are more aware of what's going on.

So there's been some discussion of possibly having a graduate assistant, or some other aid, as far as coaching is concerned. There's been some discussion of additional funds, but none of this has really been verified at this time, so we really don't know.

As far as the alumni are concerned, they've been very helpful several times, in giving monies to help send the women's gymnastic teams to the nationals. And this year, they were most generous in supplying five hundred dollars to help send a team of six to the nationals in Des Moines.

Competition, of course, is going up every year. Things are getting tougher, and I'm afraid they're going to get even tougher with the new rulings that've just come out of our national organization. Starting next year, for the fall, it is now legal for women to receive athletic scholarships. As far back as I know, it has not been acceptable, and girls were not allowed to compete at the national level if they were known to be receiving athletic scholarships. But as of next fall, they will be able to. This means that those schools that have money will be able to find better athletes. And I think that there will be a real division among schools that support women's athletics financially, and those that do not, and that the two will continue to split, with one group getting stronger and stronger, as far as their program's concerned, and the other side pretty much maintaining the same level, and that the outlook right now would be that Nevada would be in one of the schools that would not have financial support for

scholarships. No decision has really been at this point, but with the financial problems that the entire campus is facing, I would not see that monies would be spent for athletic scholarships for women.

So, again, we're looking forward to the new facility. That's not the coming year, but the following one, which should help with practice problems. We're hoping for some additional support next year, financially. If the financial assistance comes along, we would like to be able to have a tennis team and a skiing team.

The ski team has functioned informally this year. We've not really had support financially, but we have been represented at some of the competitions. Before we actually go into conference play, we must spend one year as a probationary school, so this is probably what we'll try to do next year in tennis. So we'll then have six sports that we offer the girls.

Ruth G. Hiltz: Do you have any additional faculty coming up?

There are no faculty positions for coaching at this time, and until some official thing comes through, there is no director of women's athletics, either, at this point, nor has there been, officially, anyone with this title, even though I have used it. I have functioned as the director, but technically, there is no director, other than the fact that it was a part of the physical education program, and as director of women's physical education, I've assumed both roles. But now, if the new departmental bylaws are passed, my current role no longer exists. So there has been no formal agreement as to what or who will direct the women's athletic program.

You mentioned the girls' teams. What kind of spirit do you have? The girls who do participate, are they pretty gung-ho?

Yes, we're pleased. We have the whole range, from those that, of course, want to be very, very athletic, and are willing to just train and train and train, down to those that really know nothing about athletics. In fact, I had a girl—two of them, this year—that turned out for basketball that dribbled with two hands, which, of course, is illegal. They didn't even know some of the rules. So we'd have a tremendous range of ability. But the kids that are out there train hard. They work two hours every night, and are very enthusiastic about it, and, of course, winning is important to them, and they try their hardest, and get depressed when we lose, and elated when we win, and this type of thing. But I'm glad our program still can meet those needs. I figure that if any girl is willing to come out and spend two hours a night, that the program must be fulfilling some need for her. And this is why I think it's important.

I am a little concerned. I'd say we have maybe twenty—between twenty and twenty-five—turn out for teams, so we really don't cut. Our squads should probably be cut at twenty, but for the extra few students, we don't cut it, whereas some of the other schools, at Chico and San Jose, some of the larger schools, have over a hundred girls turn out for their sports, and they cut the squads at twenty. So you can see from the selection they have, that, automatically, they're a little stronger [laughing] in the league than what we are.

But we have begun to win some games, and this was not true in the past. The conference has changed names, but it's still the same conference. But in the old conference, as far as records were available, Nevada had never won a game of volleyball, let alone a

match. They hadn't even won a game, and as far as people can find out, I don't think they ever scored over five points in a fifteen-point game. We have won three matches in a season now, and numerous, numerous games. We almost always win at least one game per match. So we're on our way up.

Of course, our women's gymnastics team has always been our strongest sport, and it still is. We're very pleased with Mrs. [Dale] Flansaas's performance, and, of course, her students, from her gymnastics school that she's starting, in a few years, will be hitting the conference. So we expect to continue to be strong in gymnastics.

You used to tell some rather interesting tales of the girls and their enthusiasm, and the way they had to travel to games, in comparison to boys. Do you want to make it for the record?

Well, because of our limited finances, of course, the one place where you can always cut back on expenses are meals, lodging, and this sort of thing. We have to pay for the officials, and we pay so much per mile. So one of the ways that we cut back is to still have the girls either bring their own lunches, or skip lunch, or bring a bag of apples, something to this extent. I have friends in various places, and so do some of the other coaches, and oftentimes we'll take sleeping bags and still sleep on the floor, because this is, again, where we have to cut the money, rather than cutting out one of the games.

And our game schedule still is between eight and ten games per season per sport, and I think this is very comparable. Not to make a direct comparison with men's programs, but they oftentimes play twenty-five or more games per season.. So we think our eight to ten is rather modest.

Again, for total financing of a program adequately, we worked a lot on this year. I think this is one of the things that's been important, is that we have projected the budgets as to how much it would cost, and, of course, we have to spend a lot of money to get caught up to par, but if we did, that we could run nine sports quite adequately on about \$18,000 per year—of course, unless we get involved with the scholarship problem, which may now present itself, which it hasn't in the past. It was just last month that they voted scholarships in, so it's going to have to be something we're going to have to face and make decisions on in the coming year.

This year has been a very active year for us. There've been a lot of decisions, both in physical education and athletics, and I certainly could not classify it as a quiet year.

WOMEN'S INTERCOLLEGIATE
ATHLETIC COUNCIL
RAYONA N. SHARPNACK,
GENERAL REPRESENTATIVE

Rayona Sharpnack: My name is Rayona Sharpnack, and I'm acting general representative of the Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Council. The Council was organized just this year, and it evolved, I think, originally, from Dr. Lilly, who's the head of the— [as] it now exists—the women's department of P. E. And her thoughts were that [seeing other schools]—that the students should have more of a say in their policies, and just different things that affect them directly, rather than having everything administered above their head. They should have, you know, at least some part in just deciding what their own future would be, and what kind of guidelines they wanted to set down for themselves, and so it started out just kind of an idea, and evolved into something that now could prove to be far reaching, I think, as far as women's athletics.

Ruth G. Hilts: It actually is the governing board of women's intercollegiate athletics?

Right. They have their policies and operating code, and we, pretty much, with

the approval of the Women's Athletic Board, decide on policies and things that we want to happen and things that we don't want to happen. And we serve in other capacities. We draw up budgets and work together to decide how our money will be spent. And, of course, everything we do is subject to the approval of the Women's Athletic Board. We work with scheduling, and like I say, finances, decisions regarding individuals, or guidelines that we want to have. Say, for instance, if we want to have girls wear dresses to the schools when we're going there to compete, that would be one of our things that We suggest, you know, or that we decide on, one of our policies.

Essentially, I think we work as a go-between—as far as the athletic board, or the president, or anybody [who] wants to know directly about athletics. We have student and faculty representatives, so that we just kinda have a small group, representative of the major portion of people, and try answering questions. The council is made up of one student representative and one coach from each sport, and the general representative,

and we have consultants, which consist of the director of P. E. and the director of athletics.

This is actually a cooperative, faculty-student group?

Right.

Let's see. As far as what we accomplished this year, this year being the first year, we had to decide exactly what we wanted to do, and one of our biggest projects was filling in the Women's Athletic Board on what we were doing and what we wanted to do, and how we could upgrade our program. So we undertook a project of drawing up a five-year budget, a theoretical budget, of what monies we would need to operate up to what we thought would be a good standard for our school. And we did a yearly budget, itemized budget, so that they could see where exactly all the money went. And then, of course, we had to establish some policies and revise those policies as we found things didn't work, and other things did work or needed clarification. We did that. So we met twice a week for a couple of months in trying to get all these things together. At first, we were able to relax a little, and we only had to meet about once a week, and then, towards the middle of winter, when we were doing all the activities, it was twice a week, and now we've kinda been able to lighten up after we got all those projects done.

We're having a meeting right now, today, as far as our election of new representatives. They're all elected by student vote. The girls decide if they want to represent us in the sports, and then they go to the NCIAC, which is the Northern California Intercollegiate Athletic Conference meetings. And we have different sports meetings, as far as scheduling meetings. For instance, I was the softball representative, and I worked with Sheila Shreve [she was the coach], and we went to a softball meeting where we did all the scheduling for next year. Also,

the NCIAC has their own policies and codes, so whenever a question came up as far as, oh, any rule interpretation, or things like this, we discussed there how we wanted it interpreted, and how we wanted it written down so that there wouldn't be any problems. And this was all done with a student and a coach from each other school. And each student and coach has one vote, so that the thing is really well balanced, as far as equality. You know, the students really do have a say in what's happening. And oftentimes, the students disagree with the coaches, and that's the way the votes go, you know? So it's interesting. If you have a strong person working in that capacity, they're more, you know, representative of the students.

And the faculty don't pull rank?

No, not in our case. I can't speak for other schools, but I'm sure that there're some in any profession, in any situation you get in, there's people that intimidate other people and are able to overcome them. But in our situation, from what I've observed in all our meetings, the students had a really strong council this year, and the students have always stood up for what they believed were their rights, and we've had different splits where some faculty and some students are together. I've been thankful that it's been that strong, because I—you know, I'm kind of a strong person, and I don't have any hesitation at all [laughing] about saying what I think, whereas I think, a lot of times in student government, and these kinds of things, people are too busy worrying about what other people think.

I think that it's been a fantastic experience for me, because I feel our college, being such a small town college, doesn't offer all the kinds of opportunities that we need to be well-rounded people when we go out of the University system, and especially in our P. E. department.

After seeing a lot of the different departments in our conference, I realize that there's a lot more things happening than we're even aware of. And this kind of thing has given me the opportunity to really get in there and work, you know, and start from scratch, like we did with the council. All we had was a name. And we got down and figured out policies, and budgeting, and just all these things that you read about in books, about what you're going to do when you're out. You know, for instance, being a P. E. major, I've had classes in organization and administration. You read about it, but it doesn't give you any, you know, idea at all about [the] practical experience, and now you've got it. So I think that, for me, it's been a great experience.

At the same time, I feel that you only get out of something what you put into it, and I've put in a lot of time, so I've gotten a lot out of it. There was a couple girls on the council that just, I guess, thought they wanted to be in it and didn't realize how much work it- would be, but stayed in it. And so they probably didn't get the kinds of things out of it that I did. But it can be a good thing, and, you know, it speaks for itself, as far as what we've accomplished this year. We've made some impact, along with the other groups on campus, as far as women's athletics, you know.

This budget that you drew up for the five-year period, this is an ideal budget, right? It isn't something that can be implemented yet.

Well, with the right funding, certainly—.

That's what I meant. You're not sure of getting the funding for it yet.

No, our biggest problem is that. We sat down and drew up what sports we felt we needed to upgrade our program and to meet the needs of all the students, and individually

went through each sport and itemized a budget of what would be needed, you know, clear down to a practice discus, right down to rosin for softball—everything, and drew it up. But right now, all it is, is on paper. We just don't have the funds unless something's done. There is supposed to be something done this year regarding it, but if nothing's done now, then we will just have to wait and see if all that work was in vain, you know. Hopefully, it wasn't.

Also, as far as athletics, personally, I've been active in it up here at the University for the last three years, and a little bit my first year. But the kinds of things that I've seen come from it, just in personal rewards, justifies any amount of money, almost, that we could ask, as far as funding the women's athletic program. I think we've proven in a couple cases that girls that were having problems scholastically, or academically, and playing in our sports program were somehow able to come right back and pull their grades up, you know. And I think a lot of it has to do with just the prevailing philosophy that we have here. Our emphasis isn't especially on winning as our primary objective. Everyone likes to win, and we're no exception, but a lot of times that overriding feeling of Winning is really detrimental to the team spirit and the individual. You know, when they're so worried about winning, they start forgetting about other things that are important, as far as going to college. And we've tried to keep the philosophy consistent in each one of the different sports, even though we have different coaches. We don't, you know, cut our squads; girls aren't cut out just because they're not good enough. Everyone's given the opportunity.

This keeps morale high?

It really does. And the girls that aren't really highly skilled learn from the ones that are, you know, just by watching, by just the team spirit

that we have, because we're really a closely-knit group. And here at Nevada, we don't have as big a turnover in people leaving the school, and, you know, we have a lot of returning players, and so they're able to—what you might [say] the leaders step down, there's always people that've been there for a couple of years that step right into it, so we keep it going. And that way, you can keep prevailing attitudes going, you know, whereas in other schools, you might have a group of really highly skilled girls that have come up through the ranks, and that get in there, really winning-oriented, that might start breaking down some of the things that you've worked really hard to build up, like no cutting of squads, and everyone playing, and things like that.

So you see it, really, as a part of your total education. It's nothing separate?

Athletics for me, personally, and for a large majority of my friends that are in athletics, is probably right around fifty percent of their college experience. In other words, I put in my time in classes, and all the things that go with activities outside of it, but my major interest, one of 'em, is in athletics for my own self, you know. I have a good feeling about playing in sports, and a lot of the girls that I play with have that feeling, too, so that when we go out to play—I mean, we—like we'll go to our class, and run right from our class so that we can be on time for practice. Like I say, it's, I would say, a fifty percent [part] of what I'm doing, you know. I plan my work and my recreational activities outside of school around my athletics, because it's that much a part of me, you know. And there's other girls that feel the same way, girls that are in other majors besides physical education, you know, music, art—we have someone from almost every different department—that have been in a lot of programs, and they find it to be a release, you know, from all the academic strain.

The only problem that keeps our program really under par from the other programs that we have seen in our conference is funding, and because we don't have the money, and the facilities, equipment, these kinds of things that you need to make an adequate program. So that rather than having fifteen girls with two basketballs, you know, to really accomplish what you want to do, and have it be a meaningful experience, you've got to have—well, at least, we would hope, one basketball per three people—. And this goes along, I think, a lot with just textbooks, you know; you've got to have something to work with to learn the skill that you want to learn. And you can't learn it by just being able to look at a typing book, you know—.

You need a typewriter as well as a book.

Yeah, right! Now, that's the kind of thing we're really lacking here, and I think that's one of the biggest problems that we face, trying to meet the needs, and fulfill our goals, and not having the facilities, the equipment, the money to do it, you know, and it's frustrating. We're really cheating ourselves. What we're doin' is settling for a lesser program than we really believe is adequate for the people we have.

As far as men's athletics, we tend to run into problems with them on this campus [as far as money] because out of the seven dollars and fifty cents that are allocated to athletics, they're given seven dollars, and we're given fifty cents. So that's kind of been a problem in the last couple years, because we need more money, and yet, they say they need more money, too. And there's been arguments that we shouldn't take from the rich to give to the poor, you know, when they say they need as much money as they need. And we have problems as far as equal time in the gym, although our department chairman has done a really fine job in trying to, you know, fix up

the equality there. We have to, oftentimes, take practice times that aren't, you know, the best for a study schedule, and things like this, because men's intercollegiate athletics have already kind of set precedent that their athletes need to play at a certain time, they need to eat at a certain time, and so, we're given time slots that maybe a lot of times are inconvenient. And, of course, they're provided with coaches and assistant coaches for every sport. A lot of times, like in football, you've got a head coach, and an assistant coach, and then three or four other coaches, you know, which is nice for the amount of people you're dealing with. But if you break it down, we've got maybe a third of that many people, and only one coach.

Do you actually feel that there's possibly only three times more boys who go out for athletics than girls?

Well, I'd just say this, that we have—well, just in football, for instance, we have sixty-four men out for football this season, and in women's softball, we have twenty-two. Of course, where they get their funds, I guess, makes a difference as far as what they've solicited themselves, the Boosters Club, and such. But we're talking about the difference between fifty girls getting \$5,000, and three hundred men getting \$300,000. So it's grossly inadequate, there's no doubt about it, you know, and so we run into conflicts.

And another part of our conflict with them is just in philosophy, because they are out to win, you know, and that's where they get their money, and that's how they get their support, as far as meeting the needs of the community. There's a lot of outside pressure for them to win, whereas with us, you know, we're not in that situation. [RGH: You want to win, but it's the game that counts?] Yeah, yeah. And the men—just like the coaches, a lot of 'em are on

contracts where if they don't win, they get fired, you know, and our women coaches aren't [in] any way connected with that kind of thing. Most of 'em are faculty or graduate students. So this is just kind of a part of their assignment, you know. It's not a do-or-die thing.

Well, girls' athletics, then, is more closely allied with physical education, as a philosophy, than is the boys'?

Yes. Even in coordinating of our activities, we—in our women's team, say, for instance, basketball, we have—the P. E. department has a women's officiating class, so we allow their officials to come in and officiate our practices, while they're still learning. We may get a practice going, and these people, you know, come in and officiate, and they're not real highly skilled in their area, but we try and work together so that they can have a better experience, and we can, too.

And as far as classes, we're allowed to miss practice if we have, you know, another class, or something that we feel is more pressing. Just last weekend, we had a dance production put on by the physical education department, and I would say, oh, over half of our women athletes were at that dance production. So it's really a closely-knit group. It's not that isolated from what's happening in physical education.

In scheduling our games, we try to give an equal number of away games and home games. And so far, we've kinda kept our scheduling down to ten games a season, so that we get five away games and five home games. We travel to Chico, Berkeley, San Francisco, San Jose, Hayward, northern California, and down in the Bay area quite a bit in each sport. We pay for University cars to make those trips, which is better than walkin', but, you know, [laughing] when we look at other schools that come—you know, like Sac State comes in an

air-conditioned, chartered bus, and drives up very leisurely, and all the girls, you know, wake up from their reclined positions, and are able to get out and do something, whereas we're, a lot of times, cramped four in a seat, you know, and you put your hand in someone else's sleeve tryin' to get your coat on [laughing]. You know, things like this, it makes it a little tough when you're traveling four hours. And see, we're the furthest away from all the schools, so we're having to travel, most of the time, long distances.

Do the other schools have motel accommodations for their teams?

Yeah. We've tried, and have been able to, more this year than ever before, on our overnights, where we're forced to travel, like if we have a game with Chico at eleven o'clock. Well, rather than get up at five in the morning and travel, and then expect to play a good game, we want to spend the night. We have been able to plan for one overnight [trip] for sure, and sometimes two. If we cut our budget down and have some less equipment, we can plan on staying in a motel, rather than what we did before [sleeping bags, you know, in the wrestling room on the wrestling mat, or—[laughing] or on gym floors, things like this]. And so now, at least we're able to get, once or twice a season, while on the road trips, a bed to sleep in before we have to play. And as far as eating, we're allocated kind of a meager amount, compared to what the men get, you know. Of course, I realize there's physiological differences in women, but not to the extent where one has to eat porridge while the other's eatin' steak, you know [laughing]. We're allocated the \$1.50 for breakfast, two dollars for lunch, and \$2.50 for dinner, which is okay, as long as you're going to places like Sambo's, and the Giant Hamburger, and McDonald's.

This year, that was one of our major objectives in getting our program going—we

were going to have, you know, prepared meals, rather than have ["brown bag" lunches]. And we have, in different instances, eaten at peoples' houses, or had another school provide lunches for us, you know, which is brown baggin' it, only they're out on trays, you know [laughing]. And this last softball season, [we] went down to Sacramento and stayed at my mom's house because we didn't have any place to stay. So we just had people in the rafters everywhere, you know. They were just stacked in the front room, in rows.

But it's a good experience, as far as unity, because it brings people together, and we have a really fun time. And we're just like a family, you know. But at the same time, we don't want to be a family living in a ghetto [laughing]. We would just as soon have the—.

You'd rather have some proper funding. But it sounds like it does good things for morale.

Yeah, it does. We have a lot of good times. We'll just get together and put on plays. A-lot of us are into music, so we get these hootenannies goin' that are incredible. We've got piano players, guitarists, drum players, singers—everybody, and we just jam. That's one of the biggest things that brings us together, I think, is our music. And that's kind of been a tradition that's carried on.

In the last year, one thing we do when we get into our huddle before each game, we start a rhythm going with our clapping. And each person just claps, and it sounds really nice, because we get everybody doing their own thing, but it's music, you know. It's one thing that, just before the game, brings us together, because we're able to make music. And everybody in the gym just turns their head and looks at us, you know, because here's a team, ready to go out and play basketball, and they're standing there [clapping rhythm]. As far as I know, we're unique [in that] we take our guitars wherever

we go. We're always walkin' with our little satchel and our big guitars, you know.

I would say, as far as the Women's Athletic Board, that I was really fortunate in serving on it, as compared to, say, the Men's Athletic Board. I was able to observe one of their meetings, and it seemed almost a farce because they didn't follow any of the Robert's Rules of Order, or take minutes, or anything that, you know, I feel would be vital to any board, a dab of history of what's done. And as far as making decisions, in five years, unless the same people are on the board, they're not going to know what kind of precedents were set down, what things worked, [or] didn't work. So I think I've been really fortunate, just as far as the Women's Athletic Board, in particular, because we have a well-rounded group of individuals. All contribute, and they're all dedicated, you know, to what we're doing. I have a complete notebook on all the issues we've discussed, and the minutes, and things like this.

I think it's been a good experience for me, in that I've been able to feel—as far as working on the board, I always felt as an equal. I was really hesitant at first when I talked to Rick Elmore about it. I wanted to be sure that it wasn't a token position, that, "We have to have so many students on it, you know, [so] we put 'em on there." Because, like I say, I'm a really strong person, and I don't take too much to sittin' back and taking a submissive role to what's going on, you know. I like to be a part of it. And the people that're on it makes it even better, because some of the people that're on it are my department head, the head of athletics, you know, as consultants. I'm able to deal with those people. When I sit in class, I'm able to say, "Dr. Laughter," you know, whatever, and carry on as a student, but when I get in that board, he's just another person to me. And when I say, "I don't like what you're saying," I

don't feel hesitant at all about airing my views, and feeling responsible for 'em, in that nothing will come down on me because of it. That has a lot to do with the individuals you're working with, too, because I'm sure there's people that, if you did that kind of thing, [it] might affect your academic situation.

A good part of what I've seen working on the athletic board is that there's other people on the campus besides athletic and P. E. people that're interested in the problem that we're faced with. I've had some really good interaction with just, say, yourself, and Lowell Shifley. I ended up heading the junior ski program, and he was one of the instructors up at the same place I was, so I ran into him, and would see him there, and I'd see Dr. Taylor around campus. I would like to get to know everyone better. It just seems nice that I'm able to spread myself out, rather than being just stuck in the gym all the time.

I don't know about the other departments, but I feel isolated, in that most of my studies and things I'm concerned with keep me up at the gym, rather than being able to find out about the Oral History department, you know, or something that's happening over in Agriculture, and things like this. So I think it's been good, to find other people are interested, and other people are interested in my cause, and if they have a cause that I'm into, I can help them, you know.

It broadens you as a citizen of the campus, then, doesn't it?

Yeah, it does.

My situation might seem kind of unique, as far as serving on both the council *and* the board, because the other girls that serve on the board don't serve on the council, and vice versa. So here I come from a council, which is probably what you might call at the bottom of

the ladder—I mean, as far as the pyramid in getting things going to the top—and then, whatever we decide there comes to me again, as far as being a member of the Women’s Athletic Board. And there’s been times when I’ve really had to make a distinction between the two, and I may have voted one way in the council and come right back to the board and done something completely opposite, because I’ve been enlightened since that time, or maybe found other things, just as far as my own philosophy, that I hadn’t considered before, you know, and talked to other people. So it’s really been great. I’ve never felt, as far as working on the council, that what we were doing was done in vain, because it was just going to a higher board that could easily override anything we did. If anything, I felt grateful that we had the people working on the board with different—you know, people that were well versed in a lot of different ways. We really have a well-rounded board, when you think about it. So it helps, as far as our policies. There’s things that just need editing that we can’t do at our level. There’s a possibility that we don’t know it, [or] we don’t have time to work it out, or there’s been times when we just say, “Well, let’s leave it to somebody on the Women’s Athletic Board, because we know they can put it in the right kind of words,” you know, as long as we can feel that we can pass on the ideas, and get the ideas across.

Another advantage, as far as working on both boards, is I felt that I can bring the ideas that really stand out in the council, the kinds of arguments, justifications, that— when you put in a simple statement, like a financial statement, you know, you may submit that to a board. But really, when the board sits down and says, “Well, is this what we want to go on to the president?” or, “is this what we want to see for our people?” then I can present those arguments from those people, you know, and

recall myself, and from my notes, what kinds of things went into making that decision in the council. So it’s really helped me tremendously to be able to see it at both levels, you know.

From your point of view, what kind of a year was it, say, compared to the last two?

I would say that this year has been the most enlightening year—well, probably, just in my whole life. I mean, it really has been a milestone, because I felt like I raised my consciousness rather than being a typical go-to-college, put-in-your-time, get-out-of-class, take-a-test, go-home student that I think, unfortunately, a lot of our universities turn out. In working in all these different capacities, as far as the council, the board, this investigation committee,* these kinds of things, I’ve really become aware of what kinds of things it takes to make change happen, that you don’t sit back in your dorm room, like I did for the first two years, and say, “Boy, that sure is rotten. I wish somebody’d do something about it,” you know. And now, I see that it takes people getting involved, and people really, you know, going to bat, and putting things on the line. And so I’ve seen it, for my own self, as just a tremendous milestone, almost a new awakening, you know. I feel like now, this last year, I’ve really started to learn things. My first three years of college, I was too busy memorizing things so I could regurgitate it for a test, you know, so that I could get the A, so that I could get the financial aid, so that I could get through school, and go out and not do anything—what I feel isn’t anything, because I feel just going out and maintaining the status quo isn’t making for change. And education means change. So, you know, it’s—

*Faculty Senate Athletic Program Study Committee.

it's been tremendous for me. I've even tried to take a deeper look into other things around the University and the community, you know, and realizing, in my own little world, that if I can go out and make a change *here*, that I can go out and make a change *there*, and that there's ways of making those changes that just take determination, you know?

Working in WIAC has given you knowledge of how to, perhaps, implement a program in some school where you go to teach, and things are stagnant?

Yeah, absolutely. And I'm saving all my stuff. I have this notebook, here, just stuffed with things that I'm saving, because I know that when I get out there, it's possible I could go to a school that knows absolutely nothing about it, and I've got to be the one that'd start it, and I've got to be able to start with, you know, something that I have, not have to worry about going—say, if I'm in Wabuska, Kansas, or something—not have to go to some big university, or go to other people, to find out how to do it. I'll have a start, you know, and then build from there. People want to be able to see something before they start turning all their wheels towards your goal. They want to see what you have in mind. So I know that, for my own self, this experience has been invaluable.

And—as far as the University—unfortunately, I still see Nevada as pretty old-fashioned, especially after being exposed to these other schools, traveling around in sports. There's girls that I know, that are in P.E., that aren't necessarily in sports, that think, “We have the greatest department in the world,” but it's only because they haven't seen other departments that can *really* widen your horizons. I mean, we're able, here, to meet the needs of the people we have, but there's so much more going on all over that

we can gain from. I think, in terms of the whole University, that we're starting to spread out, and starting to draw from other people, and really finding it. Just because it's been this way for fifty years doesn't mean that it's right, or that it always has to stay this way.

Have you seen this University grow at all, intellectually, in the three years that you've been here? Are you aware of changes?

Well, that's kinda hard to say, because I didn't really reach any awareness the first two years I was here, you know. I mean, it's hard to believe. It was a hard thing for me to realize, that I was so isolated. I was so blind to what was going on, just by staying in my room, and going out drinking, you know, all those kinds of things that you do when you first get to college. I didn't have any awareness that there was anything besides the gym and the student union, you know. But now, I start looking around, I start seeing the kinds of things that go into making a University, that it takes all these different people, and different departments, and colleges, and I see it changing, and I see it, you know, becoming what you might call more liberal. But it's going to take a long time, you know, and that's, I guess, the kind of price you pay for being isolated geographically, if nothing else. You know, when you're stuck in Reno, Nevada, or Wabuska, Kansas, or someplace else, you just haven't got that influx of people that're bringing new ideas. So—it's been a valuable experience, as far as a small college, because I think in a large college, you can get lost. You know, you can very easily get just kinda swept away, of f into a corner, whereas in a small college, man, you see—I mean, I see the people over in Nursing, and I see the people over in Engineering, you know, and you get to know your instructors as people, too.

ORIGINAL INDEX: FOR REFERENCE ONLY

In order to standardize the design of all UNOHP transcripts for the online database, they have been reformatted, a process that was completed in early 2012. This document may therefore differ in appearance and pagination from earlier printed versions. Rather than compile entirely new indexes for each volume, the UNOHP has made each transcript fully searchable electronically. If a previous version of this volume existed, its original index has been appended to this document for reference only. A link to the entire catalog can be found online at <http://oralhistory.unr.edu/>.

A

Adamain, Paul, 21, 28-31, 141-143, 163-165, 191-192, 225, 261-265
 Affirmative Action Statement, 174, 176-177, 184-186, 212, 220, 266
 Alumni Annual Giving Program, 1, 9, 10
 Alumni Association, 1-19, 256, 284
 Ambrogi, Thomas, 20, 21
 American Association of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation (AAHPER), 282
 American Association of University Professors, 20-25, 27, 31, 39, 143, 193, 223, 225, 258, 269, 270
 American Federation of Teachers, 23
 Anderson, Fred M., 107, 262
 Anderson, James, T., 205
 Artemisia, 77-79
 Articulation Board, 190
 Arts and Science, College of, 127, 268
 Associated Students of the University of Nevada (ASUN), 40-56, 60-62
 Associated Students of the University of Nevada Senate, 51-53, 63-82, 89, 95, 97-100, 103-105

Athletics

See: Intercollegiate athletics; Women's Athletics

Atkinson, Glen, 222

B

Barnes, Roberta, 206
 Bartl, Charles, P., 222
 Basta, Samuel M., 9, 13
 Black students, 90
 Black students' "sit in", 186
 Black studies program, 90
 Blincoe, Clifton, 222
 Botsford, James I., 10
 Bradford, John, 63
 Brookman, Eileen, 254, 255
 Bryan, Richard H., 236, 239
 Buchanan, James "Bucky", 107, 108

C

Caples, Robert Cole, 3
 Carter, Linn, 227
 Catholic church (Reno diocese), 157
 Catholics, 167
 Centennial celebration, 1, 2-4, 5, 121-122, 154-155
 Center for Religion and Life, 149, 152, 157-158, 159-163, 164-172
 Center for Religion, Life and Peace (Las Vegas), 156-157

China, 125
 Clarke, Jack F., 172
 Coordinating Council, 231-
 232
 Cords, Howard, 222
 Crowley, Joseph N., 132,
 179, 209, 211, 241, 268,
 269

D

Daly, Ronald T., 172
 Dandini, Alex, 113
 Desert Research Institute
 (DRI), 113-114
 Dini, Joe, 253, 254, 255
 Dodge Act, 24, 194, 224,
 236
 Dodge, Carl, 245, 246,
 247, 252
 Dodson, John, 149
 Donovan, Ruth H., 206
 Drakulich, Stanley J.,
 247, 248
 Dungan, Flora, 108, 109

E

Elko Community College
 See: Northeastern
 Nevada Community
 College
 Elmore, Richard, 40, 213
 Ephromsen, Kevin, 245-246,
 247, 252, 253, 255
 Episcopal diocese of
 Nevada, 157
 Equal Rights Amendment,
 35-38, 219
 Exely, Thomas, G., 239,
 241, 246, 247, 250,
 258

F

Faculty Senate, 21, 27,
 110, 132, 179-191, 193,
 196, 197-198, 203-204,
 210, 254, 267-268, 269,
 270-271, 275, 276, 277,
 281
 Faculty Senate Athletic
 Program Study Committee,
 176, 179, 182, 186-188,
 282, 308
 Faculty Women's Caucus, 34,
 206-212, 213, 214-217,
 218-221, 283-284
 Ferguson, Neal, 222
 Flack, JoDeen, 276
 Flansaas, Dale, 288
 Foley, John P., 247
 Foley, Roger, 142, 143,
 263
 Ford, Jean, 255
 Frank, Buddy, 73, 75-76

G

Gardner, Beatrice, 33
 Getto, Virgil, 255
 Gibson, James I., 245, 246,
 247, 248
 Glennen, Robert, 126
 Gojack, Mary, 239, 255
 Goldman, Mimi, 206
 Gorrell, Robert M., 127
 Governor's Day (1970), 142,
 261
 Grotegut, Eugene, 8, 133

H

Happiness of Women (HOW),
 36
 Havas, Paul, 1
 Hecht, Chic, 247, 248
 Heise, Bill, 76
 Homecoming, 1-2
 Howard, Anne B., 20, 206,
 208, 241, 270

Hudson, Beverly, 8
 Hug, Procter, Jr., 246,
 247-248, 250
 Hughes, Howard, 123
 Hughes, Howard, Income
 Grant, 132
 Hughes Tool Company, 123
 Human Relations Commission,
 175, 184, 266
 Humphrey, Neil, 128, 145,
 202, 205, 242, 243,
 250, 251, 254

I

Indian students, 90
 Intercollegiate Athletic
 Board, 304
 Intercollegiate athletics,
 15, 115, 116, 299, 300
 Interim Finance Committee
 (Nevada State Legisla-
 ture), 273

J

Jacobsen, Harold, 106
 Jessup, Kenneth D., 202,
 275
 "Jesus movement", 151-
 152, 153
 Jones, Ron, 76
 Joyce, Nedra (Norton),
 108, 109

K

Klaich, Daniel, 44
 Knudson, Eleanor G., 133
 Knudtsen, Molly, 262
 Kohnle, Shiela R., 172

L

Laughter, Robert, 213
 Las Vegas, Nevada, 57, 58

Law school (U. of N.), 111-
 112
 Legislature (Nevada), 35,
 36, 37-38, 48, 59, 74,
 79-82, 85, 110-111, 113,
 131, 135, 194, 195, 197,
 219, 230, 234-257
 Levinson, Charles, 241
 Lilly, Luella, 213, 279,
 290
 Lingenfelter, C.W. "Corky",
 1, 10, 11
 Linnan, John, 160-162
 Lokke, Ted, 9
 Lombardi, Louis, 107

M

Mackay Day, 86
 Manogue High School, 167
 Marschall, John, 158, 161,
 187
 McAuliffe, Jack, 2, 3
 McDermott, Paul, 107-108
 McDonald, Robert, 168
 Medical Sciences, School of,
 122-124, 131-132, 134,
 136, 201, 268, 274
 Military Affairs Review
 Board, 188-189
 Miller, George, 170
 Miller, N. Edd, 11, 12, 59,
 89, 179, 202, 205, 212,
 216, 250, 261, 266, 275
 Mordy, Wendell, 263-264
 Morgan, Dick, 237, 253,
 255, 258
 Morrill Hall, 3-4
 Morris, Wm. W. "Wildcat",
 108
 Morse, Charlotte, 35
 Moringo, Hugh, 222

N

Nash, Judy, 10
 National Council of Churches,
 160

National Education Association (NEA), 229
 National Society of Professors, 21, 23, 24, 25-26, 28, 192, 193, 222-228, 229-260, 266-267, 268, 269, 270
 Nevada Classroom Teachers Association, 252
 Nevada Humanities Committee, 160
 Nevada State Education Association (NSEA), 229, 237
 Nevins, Carroll, 139
 Norris, Jack, 252
 Northeastern Nevada Community College (Elko), 114, 232
 Northern California Intercollegiate Athletic Conference (NCIAC), 292
 Nursing, School of, 131, 135

O

Olsen, Edward A., 10

P

Padgett, James L., 115
 Pagni, Al, 6
 Parsons, Edward S., 4
 Peevers, Barbara, 206
 Peltier, Gary, 222
 Perriera, Pete, 61
 Peterson, Ann Catelain, 173
 Phillips, Virginia, 2
 Poli, Frank, 78
 Pozzi, Archie, 278
 Project Ask, 4-5, 8
 Psaltis, Ed, 237, 254

R

Reams, Robert Borden, 10, 13
 Regents, Board of, 25, 30, 57, 58, 65-66, 106-121, 128-130, 137-143, 144, 145, 157, 174, 179, 180, 182-183, 184, 192, 193, 200, 204, 205, 231, 232-233, 261-262, 263-264, 268, 269, 274, 275, 276
 Reid, Harry M., 252
 Reilley, Maureen, 79
Reno Evening Gazette, 133
 Reno International Jazz Festival, 8
 Reynolds, Terry J., 40
 Richardson, James T., 192, 222, 229
 ROTC, 188-189
 Rusco, Elmer, 222
 Russia, 125

S

Sagebrush, 45, 56-59, 72-76
 St. John, Cecelia, 7, 217
 Santini, Clark, 2
 Satir, Virginia, 168
 Senate Bill 453, 239-241, 243, 247
 Senate Bill 499, 236, 239, 241, 243, 247
 Senate Bill 568, 244, 247
 Senate Bill 650, 237, 240, 246, 247, 249, 251, 253, 255
 Sharpnack, Rayona, 213, 290
 Shifley, Lowell, 222, 306
 Shrene, Sheila, 292
 Springer, Charles, E., 263
 Steninger, Mel, 106
 Stevens, Tom, 19
 Struve, Larry, 9
 Swobe, Coe, 235, 238, 239, 247, 249, 256-257, 266

T

Tarkanian, Jerry, 117
 Taylor, Robert E. L.,
 306
 Teacher-course evaluation,
 100-103, 227
 Trachock, Richard, 213
 Twenty-to-one (student-faculty
 ratio), 190-191, 200-201, 204,
 230, 234, 274

U

Ullom, James, 254-255
 "Unionization" of
 faculty, 109, 117-121,
 143-144, 192-194,
 225-226, 257
 United Ministries of Higher
 Education, 157
 University budget, 48-50,
 110-111, 132-135, 189,
 195-196, 200-205, 268-278
 University code, 21, 28,
 181, 189, 231
 University College (UNLV),
 126
 University of Nevada, Las
 Vegas, 111-112, 115, 116,
 124, 125-127, 134,
 138, 183-184, 232,
 276

V

Vacchina, Ron, 6

W

Walker, Lee D., 245
 West Coast Athletic Conference,
 115
 Western Nevada Community
 College, 112, 113

Wilson, Thomas R. C.
 "Spike", 235, 239
 Winterberg, Friedwardt,
 192, 264
 Wolf, Harry, 91, 174, 175,
 176, 212, 215, 219
 Wolf Pack Boosters Association,
 115, 300
 Wolfe, Hans, 2, 8
 Women, Commission on the Status
 of, 173-176, 177-178,
 185, 215, 283
 Women on campus, 31-35,
 206, 209, 211, 212, 214-215
 Women's Athletic Board, 213,
 283, 290, 291, 304-306,
 307-308
 Women's Athletics, 38-39,
 176, 211-214, 279-289,
 294-304
 Women's Hearing Board, 175
 Women's Intercollegiate Athletic
 Council, 280, 290-294,
 306-308, 309
 Work Program (UNR)
 See: University Budget

XYZ

Zenoff, David, 111
 Zorn, Roman, 139

